

A PHONOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLINGUISTIC
SURVEY OF STUDENTS IN A
FRENCH CANADIAN HIGH SCHOOL

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts in French
in the
University of Canterbury
by
K. P. Corich

University of Canterbury

1984

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE NUMBER
ABSTRACT	1
I INTRODUCTION	2
1. General Introduction	2
2. Nature and Scope of the investigation	4
II PREVIOUS STUDIES OF THE LINGUISTIC SITUATION	
IN QUEBEC	8
1. Background	8
2. Studies of the sound system of Canadian French	9
3. Sociolinguistic surveys : 1966 - 1981	14
III RESEARCH METHODS	23
1. Martinet/Walter: The phonological approach	23
2. Labov: The sociolinguistic approach	29
IV METHOD	34
1. Selection of area of study and informants	34
2. The questionnaire	37
3. Development of the Questionnaire	41
V THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY	44
1. Part B1: Phonetic test of linguistic insecurity	44
2. Part B2: Lexical test of linguistic insecurity	54
3. Part B3: Attitude scale	61
4. Synthesis and critical discussion of the three attitude surveys	71

VI	PHONOLOGICAL STUDY	75
	1. Details of the test	75
	2. Results	77
VII	CONCLUSION	117
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	120
	REFERENCES	121

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE NUMBER
1. System of Canadian French nasal phonemes	13
2. Relative evaluations by French and English Canadians of English and four varieties of French	18
3. Phonetic features under study	48
4. Results of phonetic 'self-evaluation' test	51
5. Lexical items under study	56
6. Results of lexical questions	58
7. Real and average scores for attitude scale	65

ABSTRACT

The bipartite organization of this thesis shows the development and application of two linguistic surveys involving different approaches. A review of the previous studies of the language question in Québec shows the recent revival of phonetic and phonological analyses after several years of socio-linguistic investigations. Following this, the theoretical and methodological aspects of the two approaches to linguistic research; the 'phonological' and the 'sociolinguistic', are reviewed and applied in the French Canadian context.

A phonological analysis and an attitude survey involved twenty-five subjects between the ages of 16 and 17. For the phonological study, an interviewer-administered questionnaire consisting of two parts was employed. The attitudinal investigation incorporating two 'self-evaluation' tests and a Likert type scale was used to measure the degree of presence of subject's attitudes towards their own speech, and Québec French as a whole.

Results of the sociolinguistic survey indicate that Amos informants are linguistically secure; they do not undermine their own speech, nor do they recognize standard French or English as superior to Québec French. Analysis of the phonological findings show that certain features of the phonemic systems of subjects differ from both standard French and Québec French. Distinctions which are disappearing in standard French, namely /œ/ ~ /ɛ/, and /a/ ~ /ɑ/ in final enclosed position, are shown to be stable in the speech of Amos informants. A distinction rarely maintained in certain minimal pairs in Montréal speech, /ɔ/ ~ /ɑ/, is shown to be maintained in Amos. Phonetic variants of all phonemes tested are shown. Finally, the two different approaches applied in the study are contrasted and the relative merits and downfalls of each one are discussed. The 'phonological approach' to language study is favoured over the 'sociolinguistic approach' as it is theoretically superior and of greater value in empirical language study.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of two linguistic surveys conducted at a secondary school in Amos, a town in the north west region of Québec province.

The principal study was a phonological analysis of the oral production of vowel phonemes of twenty-five informants. The objective of the secondary survey was to measure the same subject's attitudes towards their own speech and towards Québec French as a whole.

The study was originally undertaken to determine whether personal observations of the linguistic attitudes of French Canadians were valid. However, in selecting a technique for attitude measurement it became clear that the identification of attitudes is largely subjective as it is difficult to isolate particular linguistic or language-related variables for study. It was decided that, rather than compromising the original aim and abandoning the attitude survey, a phonological analysis would be incorporated so that the two approaches to linguistic research could be compared.

I became interested in the language question in French Canada during a one year stay in Amos preceding university studies in New Zealand. Prior to that year, my knowledge of French was limited to the basics of written language, so Québec French became the model for learning spoken French.

During the year, my speech was subject to constant correction. Besides being corrected for grammatical and syntactic errors: corrections which a foreign language learner would find normal, I was also reprimanded for using Québec expressions and adopting Québec French pronunciation. The most striking thing about this was that my French Canadian peers seemed to be undermining their own language variety. Such comments as "parle français mais ne le parle pas comme nous ... bien que nous disions 'le tricot loose' mais tu dois chercher le bon mot ... il faut articuler comme les français de France et non pas comme nous", were abundant. The focus of their concern they said, was that if a foreigner were anticipating continuing studies in French, then the pronunciation and idiomatic expressions particular to the Québec variety would be considered as 'bad French'. In this, they were proved correct.

In subsequent university courses, it was not acceptable to articulate 'moé' and 'ben' for 'moi' and 'bien', or to use French Canadian idioms of American English origin, such as, 'c'est le fun', 'c'est trippant', or 'c'est au boutte' to describe the Standard French equivalent 'c'est amusant'. Neither was it practical to speak of one's 'weekend shopping' as 'le magasinage de la fin de semaine'.

Nevertheless, although the concern of these French Canadians served its purpose to make me appreciate the marked differences between Québec and standard French, I felt that I was a medium through which underlying linguistic attitudes were translated; my peers were denying Québec French any universal value. Yet, they would reject any overt suggestion that their French was not as extensive or capable as standard French by offering numerous examples of their variety of

French being purer: 'stationnement' rather than 'parking';
'la fin de semaine' rather than 'le weekend'.

Even an untrained observer could detect the paradoxical mixture of linguistic insecurity manifested by their denigration of the language they speak, and the national pride exhibited in their defence of it.

The present study was, as stated above, motivated by a desire to examine the linguistic situation of French Canadians using formal techniques. The university courses in English linguistic theory and application (Eng 123, 223, 224, 323) and an introductory course in French phonemics provided the necessary background.

Two different research approaches were selected for the study. The first of these examined linguistic data from a purely structural angle, and treated extra-linguistic variables where relevant. The second investigated attitudes in relation to linguistic variation and language in general. For practical reasons the two approaches have been labelled the 'phonological approach' and the 'sociolinguistic approach' respectively.

2. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION

(1) The phonological survey

The recognition that attitudinal studies alone would be inadequate prompted the decision to conduct a phonological analysis.

This was based on the questionnaire developed by Martinet and Walter who have shown the importance of a detailed analysis of idiolects in any linguistic research. Their work

will be examined later in this report.

However, the importance of a phonological analysis in the present study was also based on the lack of phonological investigations of the French in Canada. Although there is a vast corpus of documentation on the phonetic and lexical characteristics of the French spoken in Canada, no studies conducted outside the areas in close proximity to Montréal and Québec city could be located.¹ Vinay suggests a subdivision of Canadian French into five regions: Québec City and the east of the province; the west of the province; Montréal; the intermediary zones; the other provinces of Canada.²

However, this linguistic zoning must be viewed with a certain degree of suspicion until such a time as empirical studies confirm it's validity. Santerre maintains that regional variation in Québec French is minimal,³ and that full scale studies such as the one conducted by Walter for regional varieties of French are not needed.⁴

Nevertheless, since no studies have been conducted in Amos, the opportunity to examine phonology for the first time provided a challenge.

(2) Sociolinguistic study

Two complementary measures were used to assess the language attitudes.

The first was a subjective reaction test where informants were asked to evaluate their own speech by indicating whether they used one or other of two pronunciations, or lexical variables. It was decided for

this portion of the study to control variation in other linguistic items by isolating the particular variable under study. Thus, in one test phonetic variables were isolated, and in the other lexical variables were singled out for study. This method was an adaptation of a 'self evaluation' test developed by Labov.

As a complementary measure, respondents were given a questionnaire comprising nineteen attitude statements. These focused on social and psychological implications of language in Québec where French Canadians have been exposed to negative value judgements about the quality of their speech.

NOTES

1. A 'Dialog' search was conducted by the University of Canterbury library.
2. Vinay, (1973), cited by Gagne, G. "Quelques aspects socio-linguistiques du français au Canada et au Québec", Le français hors de France, Valdman, A. (ed.) Paris, 1979, p. 43
3. Personal communication
4. C.f. Chapter III. 1.

CHAPTER II

PREVIOUS STUDIES OF THE
LINGUISTIC SITUATION IN QUEBEC

1. BACKGROUND

French is the native language of six million Canadians¹, 77% of this number live in Québec and a further 15.17% in the neighbouring provinces, Ontario and New Brunswick. One third of the population of the province of Québec is concentrated in Montréal. However, only 58.9% of this city's population is francophone.

Although the British North America Act of 1867 recognized French and English as Canada's two official languages, English has always been superior to French.

In the early 1960's French Canadians rebelled against this situation by demonstrations and terrorist activities. A local dialectal form called 'joual' became prolific and speaking it was a symbol of political pretension.

The Office de la langue française (OLF) was established in 1961 to take action in an attempt to bring Québec French closer to Standard French. This was followed by the publication of several manuals of a corrective nature, such as; Phonétique corrective,² Le dictionnaire correctif du français au Canada.³

Although the benefits of such measures were purported to be great, this was not the case. French Canadians who spoke a language which had been relegated to second place after

English, started to feel linguistically insecure as a result of the efforts of the OLF to standardize Québec French. The model of standard French which they were urged to adopt posed another threat.

Linguistic chauvinism which undermines the value of Canadian French is rife in the corrective manuals. The preface to Le dictionnaire correctif du français au Canada displays this: "Il n'y a pas longtemps, ceux qui essayaient de s'exprimer correctement s'exposaient souvent aux railleries de leur entourage: on disait d'eux qu'ils parlaient en termes. Fort heureusement, cette situation aberrante est maintenant renversée et ce sont ceux-là mêmes qui négligent leur langage que l'on ridiculise aujourd'hui".⁴

In the research field at this time, two kinds of studies were being carried out: (i) purely linguistic surveys which aimed to identify the differences between Québec French and standard French, and to establish a norm for the language; (ii) sociolinguistic studies which were set out to examine the attitudes of French speaking Canadians towards the many variables influencing the status of their language. The nature and scope of research has remained essentially the same over twenty years.

2. STUDIES OF THE SOUND SYSTEM OF CANADIAN FRENCH

(1) In search of a phonetic norm

The fundamental aim in the early studies of the French language in Canada was to determine the particularities of Québec French pronunciation. Two linguists, Gendron and Charbonneau are well known for their work in this field.⁵

Although the studies were essentially similar, Gendron concentrated on identifying and describing the speech style of French Canadians from different regions, while Charbonneau's particular aim was to establish possible criteria for defining a French Canadian norm by examining practical examples.

Gendron examined the speech of seventeen educated subjects from Montréal, Québec and Trois Rivières in order to describe the general tendencies of a standardized Québec French. His findings, compiled in Tendances phonétiques du français parlé au Canada, will not be listed here as they are detailed later in this report.⁶

Gendron found that there was no variation in the speech of informants from three geographical areas. Charbonneau also found this in speakers from varying social classes. However, the different emphasis of Charbonneau's study must be observed.

Charbonneau's research was in line with the normative phonetics trend displayed in the publication of corrective manuals. His specific aim was to prove the assertion that the 'bon usage' spoken by the educated 'Québécois' should be the model in normative phonetics.⁷ For the practical study, Charbonneau examined the speech of 40 Montréal informants aged between 12 and 40 years of age, from four different social backgrounds. His findings showed that there was little difference in the speech of worker, civil servant, farmer or professional. His hypothesis was confirmed and he proposed the speech of these informants as a Canadian French norm with certain modifications to be made by speakers in the lower strata of society (accept medium timbre, avoid diphthongized vowels, avoid affricatives; [ts]+[dz], clearly distinguish back /a/ and front /a/).

In a later study Charbonneau examined the physical aspect of the articulation of nasals.⁸

Although the above studies were of a phonetic nature, both Charbonneau and Gendron touched on certain phonological aspects.

(2) A phonological insight

Gendron's treatment of phonology was indirect and limited. In discussing certain phonetic tendencies, he necessarily incorporated phonological data.

"Le français Canadien est nettement archaïsant par rapport à la norme française (...) où une évolution notable des deux a est en voie d'accomplissement (...) La distinction articulatoire et acoustique des deux a est nette et vivante en français Canadien où ces deux voyelles ne sont nullement menacées pour le moment d'une fusion en un a moyen comme c'est le cas dans la prononciation générale du français." 9

Charbonneau also made comments on the phonological aspect. Having outlined the characteristics of Québec French nasals: more closed, less nasal and longer than in standard French; he stated that the system of vowels is displaced in relation to the standard French system. He then concluded that this situation may cause confusion between a standard French speaker and a Québec speaker. For instance, confusion of a semantic nature may occur between the Québec French nasal /ẽ/ and the standard French oral vowel /ɛ/, as in /pẽ/ and /pɛ/, or between different nasal vowels such as the /õ/ of Québec French and the /ẽ/ of standard French in 'vent' and 'vin'.¹⁰

The phonological system of Québec French in relation to the standard French system was examined in greater detail more recently by Santerre.¹¹ He states that the phonological

system of vowels represents the most important characteristic of Québec French in relation to other French dialects. The number of vowel phonemes in each system constitutes the difference.

Santerre describes Parisian French phonology as a system including twelve vowel phonemes: /i, e, ε, a, ɔ, o, u, y, ø, ɛ̃, œ̃, ɔ̃/. He says that if one wants to include every possible nuance, /ɑ/ and /œ/ can be added, but as the oppositions /ɑ/ ~ /a/ and /ø/ ~ /œ/ are disappearing, he believes that an /A/ situated between /ɑ/ and /a/, and an /ø/ situated between /ø/ and /œ/ will suffice.

For Québec French, Santerre locates 17 phonological vowels: /i, e, ε, ε:, a, ɑ, ɔ, o, u, y, ø, œ, ɔ̃, ɛ̃, œ̃, ɔ̃/, to which he adds three more, ^{/I, Y, U/} Santerre states that it has not yet been determined whether the last three are entirely phonological in the system. The phonemic opposition /i/ ~ /I/ is usually found in English borrowings such as gin (gzIn) and jeans (dzin); chip (cʃIp) and cheap (cʃip).

The most comprehensive study of Canadian French phonology to date, was conducted by Pierre Léon in December, 1983. Only nasal vowel phonemes were examined.¹²

Léon discusses both the present status, and the historical evolution of the nasal vowels. He shows that the Canadian French system is larger than the standard French system, with a greater number of variants particularly /ĩ/ and /ẽ/, reduced nasality, a tendency to articulate /ã/ more towards the front, and to pronounce diphthongized nasals in enclosed syllables.

Léon parallels the evolution of the system to that which has occurred in France, showing how the complex system of

Canadian French nasals is being reduced. He discusses the possibility that geographical factors may influence change but disregards this on the basis that previous studies have shown the existence of nearly identical systems. Léon relies instead on Martinet's definition of linguistic change showing how the correlations /i/ ~ /ĩ/ and /y/ ~ /ỹ/ have disappeared due to the difficulty that there is to perceive and combine distinctive traits of nasality and closing.¹³

The reduced system of nasals consists of four nasal ^{phonemes.} It is shown on the table below with the most common variants.

TABLE 1: SYSTEM OF CANADIAN FRENCH NASAL PHONEMES.¹⁴

/ ẽ / [ẽ] [ẽ̃] [ɛ̃]	/æ̃ / [æ̃] [ã̃] [ǣ̃] [ã] [ɛ̃]
/œ̃ / [œ̃] [œ̃̃]	/õ / [õ] [õ̃] [õ̃̃]

It can be seen that [ẽ̃̃] is the variant for three phonemes: /ẽ̃/, /œ̃̃/, /æ̃̃/. Léon's study was aimed at measuring the degree of ambiguity of oppositions including these phonemes. He tested six phonemic oppositions, namely: /ẽ̃̃/ ~ /ã̃̃/; /õ̃̃/ ~ /ã̃̃/; /ã̃̃/ ~ /ẽ̃̃/; /ɛ̃̃/ ~ /ẽ̃̃/; /ẽ̃̃/ ~ /ɛ̃̃/; /õ̃̃/ ~ /õ̃̃/.

The findings of his study confirmed that the realisation of nasal vowels in Canadian French is sometimes so different from standard French articulation that they cause phonological confusion for standard French speakers. Léon's results also

identified a problem that has not been examined by previous researchers, that is, that confusion may also occur among Canadian French speakers.

"Il ne s'agit donc pas uniquement d'une interprétation inter-dialectale mais aussi intra-dialectale." 15

Léon suggests in conclusion that Québec French speakers will overcome the phonological confusion by increasing the distance between the merging phonemes, /œ/ ~ /ɛ/ and /ã/ ~ /õ/. Although the evolution of the nasal vowels of Québec French is similar to that which occurred to standard French, Léon shows that it was interrupted during a period of political uprisals in Québec. During this time many French Canadians adopted exaggerated Québec pronunciations as a way of affirming their identity. Léon maintains that the evolution process will return to normal.

"On peut supposer que le français canadien, parti d'un système de voyelles nasales issu des parlers de France et qui a actuellement déjà refait une bonne partie du chemin effectué par le français standardisé de France, continuera lui aussi la réduction de système de ses voyelles nasales sans que la communication en soit entravée." 16

The following review of sociolinguistic studies which have been conducted in Québec shows a movement in attitudes parallel to that identified by Léon as the cause of a temporary stop in the process of evolution of Québec French nasals.

3. SOCIOLINGUISTIC SURVEYS: 1966 - 1981

The extreme corrective measures to standardize Québec French have made French Canadians lose pride.¹⁷ The French language in Canada has been undermined on two levels: by English on social, political and economic levels; by standard

French on the linguistic level. D'Anglejan and Tucker explain how this influences the attitudes of French Canadians.

"It is understandable therefore that French Canadians who are now attempting to establish ties with France as a bulwark against the pressures of North America may feel sensitive and somewhat insecure with regard to their non-standard dialect." 18

Sociolinguistic studies have shown that the attitudes of French Canadians towards their language are unanimous. A trend of linguistic insecurity has been identified by Lambert, Preston, Méar-Grine and Leclerc, d'Anglejan and Tucker, Léon and Georgeault.¹⁹

A number of these studies were conducted using subjective reaction tests. Lambert pioneered a variation of this developing the 'matched guise' technique, where one speaker was used to produce different dialects or languages and subjects were asked to make judgements on personality traits of the speakers, whom they believed were all different.²⁰ Lambert showed how subjects' judgements about personality from voice cues were valuable as a measure of group biases in evaluative reactions. In the first study, two groups of Montréal university students, one French, the other English Canadian were asked to rate four male speakers reading the same extract in both English and French. The rating system was a fourteen bipolar adjective six point scale.

The English Canadian listeners rated the English guises superior on seven traits and the French guises on one. Interestingly enough, the French Canadians also rated the English guises superior by a greater margin of ten traits, with the French guises on two. These results showed that English Canadians view themselves as superior to the French, and the French group have adopted the inferior position.

A similar survey yielding comparable results was conducted by Preston.²¹ He used a European French speaker rather than a Canadian French speaker to see if there would be systematic differences in reactions to English Canadian and European French speakers. The English Canadian judges rated French and English guises equally, while the French ranked European guises more favourably than English guises.

In a following study, Méar-Crine and Leclerc attempted to correct what they saw as a downfall in the two preceding projects.²² They showed that the label 'Canadian French' is too broad to cover the range from standard Québec French to the academic French of Québec. The authors designated the linguistic code used by French Canadians in formal situations as academic French, and the linguistic code generally associated with the lower strata of society as standard Québec French.

The prediction of Méar-Crine and Leclerc that speakers of academic Québec French would be seen in a more favourable light than speakers of standard Canadian French was confirmed by their results. They explained their findings in the following way.

"Cela peut s'expliquer par le fait que le français académique est en général plus valorisé que le franco-québécois. C'est le code linguistique des magistrats, des professionnelles, des media, la langue que les grammairiens et professeurs préconisent (...) le français académique (...) représente la norme à atteindre, alors que le franco-québécois est considéré comme le parler de tous les jours." ²³

D'Anglejan and Tucker used three guises in their study: 'joual', standard Québec French and European French.²⁴ Unlike, Méar-Crine and Leclerc, they differentiated 'joual' and standard Québec French. The judgements made by 243 students,

teachers, and factory workers from three regions of Québec showed that they were moderately satisfied with their own speech, but there was a general consensus that Québec French needed improvement. This study also included forty multi-choice and semantic differential items to examine attitudes. The results showed that French Canadians viewed European French as socially more desirable than Canadian French. On the conscious level, listeners rejected European French as the prestige variant and favoured their own speech. Unconsciously, they upgraded European French.

"Among the subjects whom we studied, Québec style speech does not yet serve as a symbol of national identity differentiating French Canadians from other North Americans, and also from European speakers of French. We speculated that they may reject standard European French as a form of cultural imperialism, and show preference for the upper class French Canadian model. They did not, and the consistent pattern of downgrading both upper and lower class Canadian speech in favour of a European model (...) again emerged." 25

All these studies came, in general, to the same conclusion; that is, that individuals who expressed themselves in the French of France were rated more favourably than those who used Canadian French, and this was the same for those who spoke Canadian English, as they too were evaluated in a more favourable light than French Canadian speakers.

It is convenient to summarize the findings of the above studies in Table 2 below. A tick represents the language variety which was favoured in the particular study. The wavy line shows that the two varieties were judged equally.

TABLE 2

Research Project	Listeners	Speakers				
		English	Standard French	Academic Quebec French	Quebec French	Joual
Lambert	E	✓				
	F	✓				
Preston	E	~	~			
	F		✓			
Méar-Crine and Leclerc	F			✓	✓	
D'Anglejan and Tucker	F		✓			

The focus in the above studies was placed on two factors, that is, attitudes in relation to English and standard French. From the results, a hierarchical list, commencing with the most favoured variety, can be drawn up. It is as follows: standard French, English, academic Québec French, standard Québec French,^{and} 'joual'.

Léon conducted a subsequent study in a French college in Ontario.²⁶ The choice of this location was based on his aim to observe the different reactions of groups from varying socio-economic backgrounds and different francophone regions, towards their own language and towards the different sorts of French that Canadian society offers as models by the intermediary of radio, television, cinema, and cultural exchanges. Léon moved away from the subjective reaction test, instead employing a conventional multi-choice and nominations questionnaire.

Informants were asked to rank in order of preference the variety of French that they considered to be most useful in Canada. Standard European French was ranked first with an enormous majority over the French of Québec city; the French of Ontario was ranked third, and Montréal French, fourth. The same question format was used with English and French as options. This time English was placed first. A further question dealt with three options, standard European French, Québec French and 'joual'. Seventy of the 88 informants indicated Québec French, 18 preferred standard French and not one indicated 'joual'.

The results of the above question differ from similar questions in previous studies. This time, Québec French was favoured over standard French. There was once again a refusal of 'joual'. Léon explains that standard French enjoys a cultural prestige, but on the utilitarian level, Canadian French is better.

"(...) parler anglais permet de réussir (...) le français standard représente en majorité les genres 'prestigieux' (...) Le français Canadien appartient aux variétés (...) C'est donc tout naturellement que le français standard le plus soigné est alors assimilé au français de France, qualifié de prétentieux, admiré et detesté à la fois." 27

The most recent study dealing with French Canadians' attitudes towards language was conducted by Georgeault in four different areas: Québec, Saguenay, Hull and Montréal.²⁸ Measurement was by a two-choice scale, and four items were measured. These were, attitudes towards English, attachment to French, optimism or pessimism towards the language situation, and attitudes towards regulatory language laws.

This study revealed the following things. At least 70% of the informants considered that it is a basic right to speak

French rather than English. Similarly, current debates on the French language question are far from futile and the degree of importance attached to the problem is not great enough. They did not accept that the best solution for Québec would be to abandon French in favour of the proliferation of English. Seventy percent were optimistic because they believed French is becoming increasingly important. When asked which political frame would allow a chance for improvement to the status of French in Canada, the large majority of informants opted for Québec becoming a sovereign nation associated with the rest of Canada to establish political issues. Alternatively they suggested that Québec remain part of the Canadian confederation on the condition that it gain additional administrative power, especially in language regulation. Only a few Saguenay informants opted for Québec becoming totally independent.

The earlier studies showed that French Canadians were always downgrading their own language variety in favour of English and standard French. The more recent studies have shown that they are becoming less threatened by other varieties and thus less insecure about their own language.

CHAPTER 2

Notes

1. H. Giles and P. Powesland, Speech Style and Social Evaluation, Academic Press, London, 1975, p. 46
2. Jean-Marie Laurence, "Phonétique corrective" in Grammaire française, Guérin, Montréal, 1976. pp. 30 - 38
3. Dulong, G. Le dictionnaire correctif du français au Canada, 1978.
4. Ibid., p.1
5. C.f. bibliography, Gendron/Charbonneau
6. C.f. Chapter V.1.
7. Charbonneau firstly examined seven possible criteria which Otto Jespersen lists for establishing a spoken language norm in Mankind, Individual and Nation. The former stipulates that once chosen, the norm must achieve the following objectives: please the majority, be a simple means of expression, have clarity of articulation, will not shock the ear or provoke laughs and hostile reactions.
8. René Charbonneau, Etudes sur les voyelles nasales du français canadien, Les Presses de l'université de Laval, Québec 1971.
9. Gendron, Tendances phonétiques du français parlé au Canada, Montréal, 1968, p. 95
10. Charbonneau, op.cit., p. 107
11. Laurent Santerre, "Caractéristiques du Québécois", Unpublished draught, (personal communication).
12. Pierre Léon, "Les voyelles nasales et leurs réalisations dans les parlers français du Canada", Langue française, Dec. 1983. 60, pp. 48-63
13. Op. cit., p. 60
14. Op. cit., p. 61
15. Op. cit., p. 63
16. Loc. cit.,
17. Giles and Powesland, op. cit., p. 48

18. A d'Anglejan and G. Tucker, "Sociolinguistic correlates of speech style in Québec". in Language Attitudes: Current trends and prospects, Editors, Shuy and Fasold, Georgetown University Press, 1973. p. 4
19. C.f., bibliography
20. W. Lambert, "Judging personality through speech: A French Canadian example". Communication, vol 16. pp. 305 - 21
21. M. Preston, Evaluational reactions to English, Canadian French and European French voices, Unpublished masters dissertation, McGill University, Montréal, 1963. Cited by Giles and Powesland, op. cit., p. 56
22. Mear-Crine and Leclerc, "Attitudes des adolescents canadiens-français vis-à-vis du franco-québécois et du français académique"; in La sociolinguistique au Québec, 6, Les presses de l'université au Québec, 1974. pp. 155 - 170
23. Ibid., p. 170
24. d'Anglejan and Tucker, loc. cit.,
25. Ibid., p. 24
26. Pierre Léon, "Attitudes et comportements linguistiques", in Etudes de linguistique appliquée, 15, 1974. pp. 87 - 102
27. Ibid., p. 101
28. Pierre Georgeault, Conscience linguistique des jeunes québécois, Editeur officiel du Québec, 1981.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

Two approaches to linguistic research were used in developing the components of this project. The methods developed by the French linguist Martinet and elaborated by Walter were adopted for the phonological analysis. The research techniques devised by the American linguist Labov for subjective evaluation of language were used to examine attitudes.

Both Walter and Labov stress the importance of studying phonological diversity in relation to non-linguistic variables such as age, sex, level of education, ethnic background, social class, occupational category and geographic origin.

However, where the emphasis of Labov's work is placed on the social stratification of linguistic variables, Walter focuses on the importance of studying idiolects before considering the extra-linguistic features.

1. MARTINET/WALTER: THE PHONOLOGICAL APPROACH

In Enquête phonologique et variétés régionales du français, Walter does in fact study the variants of French phonology in relation to one extra-linguistic variable; geographic origin, but her goal is greater than simply presenting a study of the regional varieties of French. Her aims can be considered the following:

- (i) To re-establish the importance (often neglected

by contemporary researchers),¹ of studying idiolects of a representative sample, if not all the informants before proceeding to examine the distribution of phonological variables through age, ethnic, social, or other subgroups of the group under study.

(ii) To refine the method for analysing phonemic variation in the speech of individuals in order to present a model questionnaire which may be applied to French or any other language, and will elicit the requisite data for further study of the correlation between linguistic and non-linguistic variables.

Enquête phonologique et variétés régionales du français⁵ has been cited as it is the most comprehensive and recent work which deals with the 'phonological approach'. The aims of that particular study follow the Martinet tradition.

Serious research in the field of phonology was first undertaken by Martinet who in 1933 published a work which classed all the sound units according to their function in the language.² For many years, people had been examining the phonetics of language, classing sounds based on their physical nature. Martinet wanted to show that this was linguistically inadequate as different linguistic communities are opposed less by the physical aspect of articulation than by divergent ways of using sound units.

In 1941, Martinet studied the speech of 409 subjects born between 1881 and 1920.³ In this study, he found that geographic origin influenced phonemic realisation.

Fifteen years later, Reichstein examined the speech of 570 Parisian school girls from different social backgrounds

for phonemic contrast in minimal pairs involving /a - ɑ/; /ɛ - ɛ:/; /ẽ - œ/.⁴ Her results showed that these phonemic contrasts were rapidly disappearing and that certain working class areas were leading this change. Also, where Martinet's results showed that not one Parisian confused front /a/ and back /ɑ/, Reichstein's findings showed that fifty percent of the informants did not make the distinction.

The recognition that different phonological systems exist within one speech community led Martinet and Walter to undertake the task of researching and compiling Dictionnaire de la prononciation française dans son usage réel.

"Il a donc paru nécessaire à l'aide d'informateurs aussi nombreux que possible^{de} définir avec précision les latitudes de prononciation pouvant exister dans une même communauté sans gêner la communication".⁵

The findings of the study which Martinet and Walter conducted to collect data for the dictionary confirmed the conclusions of preceding studies, that phonological differences between speakers were attributable to many extralinguistic variables. Although a wide range of pronunciations were presented, the authors made it clear that their study was not exhaustive as many variables remained examined. For this reason they emphasized that the dictionary should be regarded as a work showing a number of pronunciations, but it should not be used in such a way that researchers generalize from it rather than conducting their own studies. Also, since language is always evolving, (age as a variable best exemplifies this), it would be unwise to assume that the latitudes of pronunciation presented in the dictionary would be prevalent in later years.

This is one of the principal reasons why Walter stresses the indispensable role played by a detailed study of phonological variation in individuals' speech patterns. It has been seen that many factors influence pronunciation, and therefore the phonological system of an individual. However one of Walter's greatest criticisms of other researchers and a fundamental tenet of the phonological approach itself is that one must not get carried away by the desire to study extra-linguistic variables. Walter wants researchers to realize that the definition of a phonological system and the identification of weak points begins with the analysis of idiolects. It is the study of idiolects which conditions and justifies the further examination of linguistic divergence in the community.⁶

"Une grande partie des recherches en phonologie de ces dernières années, qu'on les fasse expressément entrer dans le cadre de la sociolinguistique, ou qu'on les qualifie de linguistique tout court, s'attachent de plus en plus à étudier la diversité phonologique dans la communauté. Mais, pressés qu'ils sont de tenter de relier cette diversité phonologique à la différenciation sociale, à la position géographique, aux différentes classes d'âge ou aux situations de communication, les linguistes ne prennent pas toujours la peine d'exposer en détail le premier stade de toute recherche de ce type, à savoir l'analyse et la description des idiolectes d'un certain nombre d'informateurs au cours d'une pré-enquête ... Certains en arrivent même à ne plus voir la nécessité d'une analyse des idiolectes, attirés qu'ils sont par l'étude plus séduisante des variations."⁷

The speech of a single speaker may differ considerably from those around him. To generalize about his speech by assuming that the phonological system identified by a previous researcher for a speaker from the same region would risk invalidating results of correlation between linguistic and non-linguistic variables. This is why Walter also stipulates that one cannot pre-determine which non-linguistic variables will be studied. "On ne peut donc pas fixer à priori le nombre de variables en considération, et il faudra se laisser guider par la nature des premiers résultats."⁸

Phonological divergence can only manifest itself by the analysis of each idiolect. Then, and only then, can any trend in non-linguistic subgroup behaviour be identified. Once this is done, it is necessary to establish some order of priority to the study of the non-linguistic variables. Walter's own examples best illustrate this point:

"Albert Dauzat constatait déjà en 1950 qu' un ouvrier toulousain parle un français bien différent d'un lettré toulousain (...) Ce que l'on peut simplement avancer, c'est que tous les enquêtes réalisés à ce jour montrent que les différences entre un lettré toulousain et un lettré parisien sont beaucoup plus considérables que celles que l'on peut constater entre un lettré toulousain et un ouvrier de la même ville, ou entre un lettré parisien et un ouvrier parisien."⁹

A further example illustrates a fundamental point in Walter's theory:

"(...) il semble que l'on doive constater une différence de comportement phonologique plus considérable entre un médecin de Paris et un médecin de Marseille qu'entre

le même médecin parisien et sa femme de ménage parisienne. Entre ces deux derniers, on a pu relever des différences, mais il semble qu'elles concernent plus souvent les réalisations phonétiques des oppositions que l'existence des oppositions elles-mêmes."¹⁰

In the French context, regional and age differences are therefore more important than social variation. Temptation to examine the speech of subjects in the latter category may yield only non-distinctive differences in sound units. Hence, Martinet's comment:

"On rencontre encore des exposés ou, à ne pas distinguer ce qui est phonologiquement pertinent et ce qui ne l'est pas, la réalité linguistique se dégage mal."¹¹

Walter witnesses the importance of the study of phonological variation in the speech of a single speaker, careful selection of non-linguistic variables, and the establishment of an order of priority for the study thereof.

From a theoretical angle, it has been the guidelines of Walter and Martinet which have made the author appreciate the importance of studying phonemic variation in individuals speech patterns.

Walter's second aim as stated above was to present a model questionnaire containing an inventory of all the possible oppositions which exist in French. The phonemes are classed in four positions: final open, final enclosed, non-final open, non-final closed, according to Walter's definition that a phonological system is the set of sound units which are commutable in a given position.¹²

Walter's questionnaire which is based on the format of her predecessors Martinet, Reichstein and Deyhime is adopted

in the present study.¹³ By detailing precisely every stage of her study from the selection of phonological variables, pilot studies and fieldwork to the exposition of results, Walter provides a solid grounding for her followers.

2. LABOV: THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC APPROACH

The sociolinguistic approach is based on the assumption that linguistic behaviour and language attitudes are concomitant. The methods which are discussed here were pioneered by Labov whose particular area of study encompassed examination of variation in the speech of racial and social groups.

Labov claimed that although an idiolect may appear random, variation in one speech community is predictable as it is determined by extra-linguistic factors. To examine this claim, he isolated predetermined linguistic variables and measured attitudes towards them.

However, to do this, Labov had to find a technique whereby attitudes could be examined towards one variable, rather than towards language itself. This entailed adopting old and developing new methods.

Subjective reactions to language can be identified in two ways: (i) unconscious judgements made by an informant which translate attitudes; (ii) stereotypes which have risen to the plane of social consciousness.

In general, measurement of the individual's reaction to his own speech patterns, or the speech forms of others involves studies on the unconscious level, while attitudes about language per se are formulated ideas on the conscious

plane of thought and can be tested by means of direct questions and attitude scales.

Labov's aim was to find out whether attitudes were uniform with the distribution of a particular variable. It was not possible to test this by direct questions (e.g. "What do you think of the usage of variable 'x' rather than 'y' by certain people?"), as most informants would not understand the linguistic technicalities.

A number of tests have been developed to elicit information about attitudes without the informant knowing that his stereotypes were being tested.

The most widely used and first to be adopted by Labov was the 'subjective reaction test'. A tape recording is made of several speakers saying the same thing or reading a piece of prose. The informant is asked to listen to the taped voices and answer questions about them. Two different response formats can be used. One is to ask objective questions about the speaker such as, "what do you think his job would be?". The second response format is evaluative asking the informant to locate the speaker somewhere on a bipolar adjective scale. The results of these tests show that informants are able to make judgements about speakers through voice alone. These judgements translate the informant's attitudes towards the speech form used.

However, Labov found that although this test is a valuable way of showing that listeners categorize certain speakers socially, it does not isolate their attitudes to any one feature of language; grammar, phonology, prosodic features, lexical items. He therefore modified the standard subjective

reaction test in order to isolate certain variables making it possible to identify the particular linguistic variables to which informants are reacting.

Labov selected twenty-two sentences with each one illustrating just one or no sensitive phonetic variable.¹⁴ The sentence, "He darted out about your feet before a car and got hit hard", was said two times, the second time with a single pronunciation difference from the first; one of the post-vocalic 'r's was not articulated as a consonant. This was in a New York city study where 'r' is an important social variable. The informants were asked to guess the job of the speaker. The first utterance was rated as belonging to a secretary, the second to a switchboard operator. It was assumed that differences in ratings were due to the differences in the pronunciation of 'r' as the sentences were otherwise identical.

This discussion so far has dealt with Labov's treatment of attitudes towards the speech forms of others. His construction of the 'self evaluation' test enabled him to examine the informant's attitudes towards their own speech. A series of words are pronounced in two different ways by an interviewer. The informant is asked to circle which of the pronunciations he thinks is correct. Following this, he is required to choose the pronunciation he actually uses. The number of items in which the informant's choices are different is the index of linguistic insecurity.

Labov's earlier findings showed that lower middle class speakers tended to hypercorrection in their usage of 'r', and the results of the 'self evaluation' tests showed that this was rooted in profound linguistic insecurity. "In general we may

say that those who adopt a standard of correctness which is imposed from without and from beyond the group which helped form their native speech pattern are bound to show signs of linguistic insecurity ... linguistic insecurity leads directly to hypercorrection for the insecure speaker has not internalized his newly acquired norms and he has no automatically applied role to let him know where to stop correction".¹⁵

One of the aims of the present study was to isolate two features of the language in Québec; pronunciation and lexical items, to examine attitudes towards them. A slightly modified version of Labov's 'self evaluation' test was used for this purpose.

NOTES

1. Henriette Walter, Enquête phonologiques et variétés régionales du français, Presses universitaires de France, 1982, p. 18
2. André Martinet, Remarques sur le système phonologique du français, 1933, cited by Walter in La phonologie du français, p. 23
3. André Martinet, La prononciation du français contemporain, témoignages recueillis dans un camp d'officiers prisonniers, Paris, 1945
4. Ruth Reichstein, "Etude des variations sociales et géographiques des faits linguistiques", Word, 16, 1960 p. 55 - 99
5. Henriette Walter, La phonologie du français, p. 13
6. Henriette Walter, Enquête phonologique et variétés régionales du français, p. 19
7. Ibid, pp. 18 - 19
8. Ibid, p. 38
9. Ibid, p. 52
10. Henriette Walter, La phonologie du français, p. 9
11. André Martinet, "Ce que n'est pas la phonologie", Langue française, Dec. 1983/60 Paris, p. 7
12. Henriette Walter, La phonologie du français, p. 40
See also Enquête phonologique et variétés régionales du français, pp 207 - 221
13. See bibliography
14. William Labov, "The study of language in its social context". Sociolinguistics, London, 1972
15. William Labov, The social stratification of English in New York City, New York, 1966, p. 475

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

1. SELECTION OF AREA OF STUDY AND INFORMANTS

The study of phonology and sociolinguistic attitudes of French Canadian subjects by a New Zealand student is not a simple task. The most obvious limitation of distance from the area under study was binding in the preliminary stages. The two original plans, as detailed below, were abandoned and it was decided that a brief visit would be made to Québec.

The first of the projects was to undertake the study on French Canadians in New Zealand. However, the number of subjects who could be located was too few to make the study worthwhile. Furthermore, of those who could be located, the age and time spent in New Zealand was so varied that the author feared that one could do nothing more than a series of isolated surveys producing disparate and inconclusive results. All prospective subjects who were approached displayed proficiency in the English language which would undoubtedly allay any previous sentiments of linguistic insecurity with regard to English, which they may have held when still in Québec, and not in command of the majority language of Canada.¹ This observation, coupled with the fact that integration into a different linguistic environment would have some influence on attitudes towards language, led the author to hypothesize that the linguistic attitudes prevailing among French Canadians in New Zealand would not parallel those of their counterparts in Québec. A similar prediction was confirmed by Georgeault

in a study examining the attitudes of French Canadians before and after having contact with English speakers:

" ... après être entrés en contact avec les anglophones, encore plus de jeunes francophones en ont une impression plutôt favorable. Cette dernière est, par ailleurs, partagée par un plus grand nombre d'informateurs de Québec (75.6%), du Saguenay (70.0%), et de Montréal (69.9%) que d'informateurs de Hull (59.2%) ... ce sont surtout les jeunes qui n'avaient aucun sentiment particulier à l'égard des anglophones qui ont acquis une impression favorable et que les contacts avec les anglophones a davantage fait changer d'opinion les jeunes des milieux francophones que ceux des milieux mixtes." 2

Léon, in a study of the attitudes of French Canadians residing in an English community also found a change in attitudes and linguistic behaviour:

" Le désir de correction manifesté par l'ensemble du groupe va dans le sens de l'affirmation d'identité canadienne française. La revendication d'identité semble proportionnelle au degré d'acculturation." 3

With empirical evidence to confirm attitudinal changes resulting from contact between speakers of different languages, it seemed that the present study could not be conducted in New Zealand without compromising one of the fundamental aims; that is, to measure linguistic attitudes of a group of French Canadians displaying similar characteristics of those mentioned on page one of this report.

The alternative plan to conduct the survey 'in absentia' by posting the questionnaires and relying on someone to distribute them in Québec was also abandoned as it would mean forfeiting the opportunity to carry out the fieldwork stage. As one of the decisions prompting the present study was dependent on the desire to consolidate linguistic skills, the delegation of the actual fieldwork to someone else was too great a sacrifice to make. Hence, the final option was adopted.

The visit to Québec was planned for February 1984. The inflexible nature of the travel plans, and financial and time constraints meant that the questionnaire had to be prepared before arriving so that the fieldwork could be carried out immediately. For this reason, all pilot studies were conducted in France.

It was decided that a group of senior high school students in the one secondary school in Amos would be used as informants in the survey. The choice of Amos was pragmatic. Having spent a year there, contacts were already established, and I possessed a certain amount of background knowledge about the town.

In July 1983, a letter was sent to Monsieur Fernand Roy, Principal of "polyvalente la Mosaique" high school, requesting permission to use a group of students as informants in a linguistic survey. The response from Monsieur Roy was favourable. A following letter (November 1983), detailed that where possible, a group of senior students of mixed ability and in a non-linguistically related course would be preferred. Two reasons underlay this stipulation: it seemed wiser to avoid the possibility of getting a very bright class who might guess immediately the underlying purpose of the study and perhaps be tempted to hyper-correct. Similarly, I did not want a language class where a French or English teacher might be present so that students would feel pressured into 'speaking well' for fear of being reprimanded. Once all these preliminary contacts were established, the questionnaire was constructed.

2. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire is comprised of three parts. The first of these is questions relating to the background of the informant. The second is tests for the sociolinguistic study, and the third part is the phonological study. The divisions are as follows:

- | | | |
|------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| A. | Biographical questions | |
| B.1. | Phonetic test |) |
| B.2. | Lexical test |) |
| B.3. | Attitude scale |) |
| | |) Sociolinguistic study |
| C.1. | Minimal pairs |) |
| C.2. | Reading text |) |
| | |) Phonological study |

Part A. Détails biographiques de l'informateur

1. Numéro du témoin:
2. Sexe:
3. Niveau scolaire:
4. Date de naissance:
5. Lieu de naissance:
6. Nationalité:
7. Lieu d'origine du père:
8. Lieu d'origine de la mère:
9. Pays ou villes (Canada) ou vous avez habités pendant au moins un an (à quel âge?):
10. Nombre d'années passées à AMOS:
11. Est ce que vous parlez d'autres langues?
Si oui, les quelles? ...
... à quel niveau?
12. Etudes et/ou professions envisagées:

Part B.1. Ecoutez bien les mots suivants. Chaque mot est prononcé de deux façons différentes. Est-ce que vous articulez de la première ou deuxième façon? Veuillez marquer votre réponse dans les cadres ci-dessous.

		<u>Première</u> <u>Façon</u>	<u>Deuxième</u> <u>Façon</u>
1	Une dime		
2	Je siffle		
3	Je suce		
4	Une jupe		
5	Un rempart		
6	Une banane		
7	Une entame		
8	Un phare		
9	Du verglas		
10	La vertu		
11	Perdre		
12	Un anniversaire		
13	Février		
14	Une célibataire		
15	C'est agréable		
16	Lécher		
17	Déjà		
18	Une paume		
19	Un saumon		
20	Une tomate		
21	Ordonner		
22	Un soleil		
23	Le jeune		
24	A peu près		
25	Un jeudi		
26	Une minute		
27	Une musique		
28	Il emprunte		
29	Un brin		
30	Un anglais		
31	Un français		

Part B.2. Remplacer les points par un ou plusieurs mots que vous utiliseriez dans une conversation de tous les jours.

- 1 On achète le tabac et les journaux au/à la
- 2 Pour dormir un homme met un pyjama et une femme met un/une

- 3 Pour tricoter il faut de la laine et des à tricoter.
- 4 Il y a sept jours dans la semaine: cinq jours de travail et le/la
- 5 Quand on veut envoyer une lettre, on la met dans un/une
- 6 Les voleurs savaient que le/la se trouvait derrière le tableau du salon.
- 7 Pendant les ventes, j'ai beaucoup d'argent sur mes achats.
- 8 Si vous êtes pressés, prenez la grande route vous allez cinq minutes sur l'horaire.
- 9 Avant qu'on puisse répondre, il faut que l'on nous une question.
- 10 Il faut que tu Pierre à tes parents qui ne le connaissent pas encore.
- 11 Aux magasins, on fait du
- 12 Si on veut voyager d'un endroit à un autre sans argent, on se met au bord de la route et on fait
- 13 Si quelque chose manque d'intérêt, on dit que c'est
- 14 Si on s'amuse bien, on dit que c'est
- 15 Cela fait plus de six mois qu'il voudrait parler avec elle mais il n'ose pas car il est trop

Part B.3. Renseignements

- Vous trouverez ci-dessous 23 énoncés pour lesquels vous devrez indiquer votre accord ou votre désaccord.
- Lisez-les attentivement.
- Si vous êtes entièrement d'accord avec l'énoncé, entourez EA.
- Si vous êtes d'accord, sans plus, entourez A.
- Si vous n'êtes pas d'accord, entourez P.
- Enfin, si vous n'êtes pas du tout d'accord, entourez PA.

Ceci n'est pas un examen, il n'y a pas de réponse juste ou fautive. Il s'agit seulement de mesurer vos sentiments sur quelques aspects de votre langue.

Votre nom sur le papier est facultatif.

- | | | |
|------------|---|---|
| EA-A-P-PA- | 1 | Le français de Québec est aussi valable que le français de France. |
| EA-A-P-PA- | 2 | Il vaut mieux parler anglais que français au Canada. |
| EA-A-P-PA- | 3 | Malgré la situation, il ne faut jamais changer sa façon de parler. |
| EA-A-P-PA- | 4 | Une personne qui s'exprime en très bon français devrait recevoir un meilleur salaire. |
| EA-A-P-PA- | 5 | Je dois améliorer ma façon de parler. |
| EA-A-P-PA- | 6 | Quelqu'un qui parle joual n'a pas l'air d'être très intelligent. |

- EA-A-P-PA- 7 On ne doit pas être jugé à cause de son accent.
- EA-A-P-PA- 8 Lorsque un canadien français parle avec l'accent de la France, cela semble prétentieux.
- EA-A-P-PA- 9 Lors d'un interview pour un emploi, il vaut mieux parler avec l'accent français que parler joual.
- EA-A-P-PA- 10 Je dois parler anglais pour trouver un bon emploi.
- EA-A-P-PA- 11 Le joual doit être réservé pour le discours entre amis et le bon français pour d'autres situations.
- EA-A-P-PA- 12 L'accent d'un candidat ne devrait pas jouer un rôle dans le choix d'un employé.
- EA-A-P-PA- 13 Tout canadien français devrait parler joual.
- EA-A-P-PA- 14 Le français parlé en France est mieux que le français parlé au Canada.
- EA-A-P-PA- 15 Quelqu'un qui parle un bon français à l'air d'être plus instruit.
- EA-A-P-PA- 16 Au Canada, le français n'est pas aussi valable que l'anglais.
- EA-A-P-PA- 17 Les Québécois doivent défendre leur accent.
- EA-A-P-PA- 18 Le français du Canada n'est pas un bon français.
- EA-A-P-PA- 19 Je suis fier de mon accent.

Part C.1. Dans un parler tout-à-fait naturel et familier,
prononcez-vous de façon identique:

- 1 Patte et pâte?
- 2 Bas et bat?
- 3 Mètre et maître?
- 4 Fée et fait?
- 5 Pomme et paume?
- 6 Sol et seul?
- 7 Jeune et jeûne?
- 8 Peu et peux?
- 9 Brin et brun?
- 10 Encadre et un cadre?
- 11 Etain et étang?
- 12 Bêle et belle?
- 13 Armé et armée?
- 14 Empreinte et emprunte?
- 15 Port et part?
- 16 Fort et phare?
- 17 Dans FAIS-LE par exemple, prononcez-vous le E avec le timbre du EU de feu ou celui du EU de peur, ou avec un timbre différent de ces deux voyelles?

Part C.2. Extrait à enregistrer

Je vais vous raconter une histoire.
Il n'y a pas de vrais faits car il s'agit d'une fée. Il y avait un mâle qui était mal dans sa peau. Bref, il n'avait pas de pot. Un jour, il a mis une pomme dans sa paume et il l'a lancée vers le maître qui lui a donné des coups avec un mètre.

- "Je suis très peu content de toi" - lui a dit le maître.
- "Tu peux partir tout de suite" -

Il faut dire que le jeune homme était prêt d'aller sur le pré. Il n'aimait pas le maître. Il ne l'avait jamais aimé. Il est sorti pour prendre un brin d'air. Tout d'un coup, une idée lui est venue dans la tête: "Je vais m'échapper". Il ne voulait pas que le maître l'entende donc, il marchait à pas feutrés sur les feuilles mortes.

- "Moi" lui dit-il, "je vais partir le mois prochain pour faire une conquête. Les soldats de l'armée de Napoleon étaient armés de sabres, mais moi, je vais aller en bateau armé d'un bâton".

3. DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

(1) Biographical Questions

The purpose of these questions was to identify the informant by asking questions relating to their background; age, sex, date and place of birth, number of years spent in Amos, origin of parents, level of education, professional aspirations and languages spoken. Name was purposely omitted so as to give the informant the option of anonymity. However, all informants were enthusiastic and co-operative and chose to be identified.

The variables of age and level of education are largely neutralised in the present study. One can fairly safely predict that these variables will be homogenous as the informants selected are all in their final year of secondary school.

Information about the origin of parents and the number of years spent in Amos is requested for two reasons. The first being that the information given may be used as an elimination process. If for instance, a member of the class were an English Canadian or a student of any origin other than French Canadian, the results of his questionnaire would not be examined in the main analysis as they would not be relevant to the aims of the present study.

The question asking if the informant speaks any other languages is valuable in the analysis of attitudes. It is a fair assumption to make that second-language acquisition is usually the combination of scholastic study and some contact with native speakers of the language; and it has already been noted that contact between speakers of two languages has an influence on linguistic attitudes. ⁴

Following the advice of Walter, the selection of non-linguistic variables was not made randomly. Questions about the social class of informants were not included. This omission justifies itself by the relative youth of the group. In their last year of school, they would be more inclined to conform with the norm established by their peer group, rather than that of a more prestigious social class. Social class of parents is not a fair indicator as people of this age are in the transition stage of deciding on future options which may not parallel those of their parents.

The limitations imposed on the present study were motivated by the concern to keep the scope of research within the dimension of the objective.

(2) Sociolinguistic and phonological components of
the questionnaire

For clarity of presentation, the development of the remaining components of the questionnaire is discussed immediately preceding the findings of the particular test.

Notes

1. Cf. Chapter II, 1
2. Pierre Georgeault, Conscience linguistique des jeunes québécois, Editeur Officiel de Québec, 1981, p. 56
3. Pierre Léon, "Attitudes et Comportements linguistiques, problèmes d'acculturation et d'identité." Etudes de linguistiques appliquée, 15, 1974. p. 101.
4. Georgeault, loc. cit./Léon, loc. cit.

CHAPTER V

THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY

The sociolinguistic analysis consisted of three tests; parts B1, B2 and B3 of the questionnaire.

It was stated in the introduction of this report that two complementary measures were used to examine attitudes. The first measure^{was} comprised of parts B1 and B2^{which} were adaptations of Labov's 'self evaluation' test treating phonetic and lexical material respectively. In these, the informant's attitudes to his own speech patterns were measured on the unconscious level. Part B3, the second measure, identified attitudes on the conscious level, towards the language situation in Québec.

The essential difference between the two subsections, B1 and B2 on the one hand, and B3 on the other, is that in the first the informant is not told the aim of the questions, whereas in the second, he is.

1. PART B1: PHONETIC TEST OF LINGUISTIC INSECURITY

1.1. Aims and method

Part B1 of the questionnaire was aimed at determining the informant's evaluation of his own speech patterns. These were measured by a method adapted from Labov's 'self evaluation' test.

Labov postulated that individuals evaluate their own speech in accordance with the norms they acknowledge, rather than on what they actually say or how they articulate a

particular sound. He further hypothesized that this tendency indicates a degree of linguistic insecurity.

According to Labov, linguistic insecurity is manifested by strong negative attitudes towards one's native speech, hypersensitivity to stigmatized features of language, constant striving for correctness, and an inaccurate perception of one's own speech.¹ These conditions can be identified in a test where for a selected list of socially marked variants, the subject is asked which of the two forms is correct and then which he actually uses. An index of linguistic insecurity is derived from the total number of items where the two responses differ.

In Labov's New York city survey, the 'norm' was taken as the prestigious upper class speech style. However, unlike the American context, where speech differentiation is largely class related, the prestige speech style of Québec, identified by Preston, and Méar-Crime and Leclerc, is standard French.²

In this 'self evaluation' test, a list of words representing characteristics of the phonetic organization of Québec French was devised. The informant was played a recording of two speakers articulating these words; one with a standard French pronunciation the other with a Québec French pronunciation. The informant was given a response sheet and asked to indicate which pronunciation he believed he used. In a later interview, the informant was asked to read the list of words aloud, and to comment on which pronunciation he thought was 'correct'.

A standard French speaker and a Québec French speaker were used to make the tape recording of the list of words. The two speakers, both female were chosen from two groups.³ The

French speaker was selected from a group of four students who made themselves available for the recording. She was chosen over the other three as she is a native of Orléans and her speech was the most representative of standard French.⁴ The Québec speaker was chosen from a group of three females who were on work exchange programmes at the 'Association France-Québec' in Paris. She was selected as she was the most recent arrival in Paris and her speech patterns illustrated the characteristics of Québec French.

The authenticity of the speakers' pronunciations was checked by three linguistics graduates; a present student at EPSCI in Paris, and two masters' students at the University of Ottawa.⁵ The two pronunciations for each word were judged to be accurate representations of Québec French pronunciation and standard French pronunciation.

Consistently throughout the recording, it is the French speaker who pronounces the word first.

The selection of words obeyed two criteria: (i) Each word had to include a characteristic feature of Québec French pronunciation. (ii) The word had to be one used commonly by speakers of both varieties so as to avoid confusion on the part of the two speakers and the Québec informants.

The first step was obviously drawing up an inventory of the particularities of Canadian French pronunciation. The findings of Gendron and Charbonneau were consulted for this purpose.⁶

1. The oral vowels /i/, /y/, /u/ which always maintain the same timbre in standard French, become more open and centralised before certain final consonants. This occurs in syllables enclosed by the non-lengthening consonants [p, t, k,

g, b, d, f, s, ʃ, m, n, l, ʎ, w]. Where for instance, the pair 'dimanche/dime' would be [dimɑ̃ʃ, dim] in standard French, a variant would be articulated in the second word in Québec French, [dIm]. This variant also occurs in unstressed syllables in many words such as: 'éclipse, minute'.

2. The oral vowel, open /ɛ/ has several variants in Québec French pronunciation. Depending on the phonetic context, it is subject to becoming more open, more closed or nasalised: (i) It is more open, particularly in final open position so that it tends towards front /a/ in words such as: 'français, anglais'. Similarly, preceding /r/ in enclosed position so that 'fermé' [fɛrme] becomes [farme]. It is also found where /ɛ/ is etymologically long as in 'aide, prêtre'. (ii) /ɛ/ becomes nasal when this vowel is long preceding a nasal consonant, as in 'reine, chêne'.

3. As far as the vowel 'A' is concerned, it has been found that little distinction is made between front /a/ and back /ɑ/ in standard French.⁷ For the standard French 'A' there are several nuances in Québec pronunciation: (i) The timbre becomes more sombre and it is articulated at the very back so that it is often confused with open /ɔ/. (ii) An 'A' which is articulated between a standard French 'A' and the above variant form.

4. /ɔ/ is often confused with /ɑ/ producing the same effect as in (i) above.

5. The oral vowel /œ/ is often nasalised and more open when preceding the consonant 'r'.

6. /ø/ is little changed but tends to be less clear and pure. It tends towards /u/ in certain words such as: 'jeudi', peu'.

TABLE 3: PHONETIC FEATURES UNDER STUDY

Characteristic of QF	Word	Pronunciation of French Speaker	Pronunciation of Quebec Speaker
[i, y, u] → [I, Y, U]	dime, siffle, bouche, jupe, suce, minute	/dim, siflɔ, buʃ, ʒup, sysə, minyt/	/dIm, sIfɫə, buʃ, ʒʏp, sysə, minɣt/
[i] → [ɛ]	musique	/mysik/	/mysek/
[ø] → [u]	à peu pres, jeudi	/a pø pre, ʒødi/	/a pu pre, ʒudi/
[œ] → [ɛ]	jeune	/ʒoen/	/ʒɛn/
[o] → [a]	saumon	/somɔ̃ /	/samɔ̃ /
[ɔ] → [a] ^{betw} + [ɔ]	tomate, soleil, ordonner	/tɔmat, solɛj, ɔrdɔne/	/tamat, salɛj, ɔrdane/
[ɛ] → [a]	anniversaire, vertu, verglas, perdre, anglais, français	/aniversɛr, verty, vɛrgla, pɛrdɛ (ə) ɑ̃glɛ, frɑ̃sɛ/	/anivarɛsɛr, varty, vɑ̃gla, pɑrdra, ɑ̃gla, frɑsa/
[e] → [œ]	célibataire, déjà février	/selibatɛr, deʒa, fevrije/	/soelibatɛr, doeʒa, foevrije/
[e] → [i]	agréable, lécher	/agreablɔ, leʃe/	/agriablɔ, lifɛ/
[a] → [ɔ]	entame, phare, rempart	/ɑ̃tam, faɛ, rapaɛ/	/ɑ̃tɔm, fɔɛ, rɑ̃pɔɛ/
[a] → [e]	banane	/banan/	/benan/
[ɛ̃] → [ɛ̃ɣ]	brin	/brɛ̃/	/brɛ̃ɣ/
[œ̃] → [ɛ̃ɣ]	emprunte	/ɑ̃prœ̃ t/	/ɑ̃prɛ̃ɣ t/

7. /o/ is not as clear as it is in standard French.

8. /e/ is sometimes confused with the high front vowel /i/. Also, it approaches /œ/ in certain words in a random manner.

9. There is a marked tendency in Québec French pronunciation to diphthongize nasal and semi-closed oral vowels when they are long and often in final closed position: pere (pa-ère); peur (pa-eur).

10. In final enclosed position, /ã/ is frequently realised in Québec French as a badly nasalised front /a/. Furthermore, there is a tendency to diphthongize /ã/ so that it becomes /ãw/. For instance 'ange' would be [ãʒ] in standard French and [ãwʒ] in Québec French.

11. The nasal vowels /ẽ, ǣ, ɔ̃, œ̃/ are more closed, longer and less nasal than their standard French counterparts. They are sometimes trailed by a nasal consonant appendix.⁸

The above list is not exhaustive, rather, it shows the most prominent characteristics of Québec French pronunciation. The words in the phonetic test were selected as representative of the characteristics of Québec French outlined above.

2. Results

The aim of this 'self evaluation' test was to determine the informant's evaluation of his pronunciation of vowels. Interpretation of the results of this technique is based on the postulate that negative value judgements translated by inaccurate perception of one's speech indicate linguistic insecurity, and the corollary, that positive judgements indicate that the informant is linguistically secure. The

findings of this survey show that the majority of subjects are in the latter category.

In this first session, informants listened to the recording of the two speakers and indicated on their response sheet which of the two pronunciations they believed they used. Responses to this exercise were varied. In the second session where the informants were asked to say which of the two contrasting pronunciations was the 'correct' one, twenty-three of the twenty-five informants stated that neither was more correct than the other. The third task asked of the informant was that he articulate each word so that his evaluation of his speech could be verified. All of the twenty-five informants articulated the words in the same way as the Québec speaker with the exception of three words, 'rempart', 'entame' and 'phare'. There were still detectable differences between their pronunciation of these words and the standard French speaker's pronunciation which is why they are included in the table of results.

The informant was given a score which was the total number of items which he articulated differently from his stated pronunciation. These scores are presented on Table 5. Figures are given at the bottom of each vertical column for the number of items which the informant pronounced differently from his stated pronunciation. The figures at the end of each horizontal column represent the number of informants who incorrectly perceive their pronunciation of the particular word.

TABLE 4: RESULTS OF PHONETIC 'SELF EVALUATION' TEST

	Arcand	Baulne	Bechar	Bergeron	Bisson	Boutin	Delcambre	Desbiens	Dominique	Duhaime	Fontaine	Gaulin	Gervais	Goyette	Lacombe	Lanoix	Laroche	Lécuyer	Lefebvre	Rodrigue	Rouiller	Simard	Tremblay	Trépanier	Vachon	
1 dime	/			/			/			/			/									/				6
2 siffle				/			/						/				/									4
3 suce													/													1
4 jupe													/	/			/							/		4
5 rempart							/						/				/									3
6 banane							/						/	/				/					/	/		6
7 entame							/			/			/		/	/										5
8 phare							/						/			/										3
9 verglas							/						/	/		/							/	/		6
10 vertu										/			/		/	/										4
11 perdre			/				/						/		/		/									4
12 anniversaire							/						/	/	/		/									4
13 février				/	/		/						/	/			/									6
14 célibataire	/																/									2
15 agréable							/										/									2
16 lécher																										0
17 déjà				/			/		/								/									4
18 paume							/																			1
19 saumon	/		/												/		/									4
20 tomate																										0
21 ordonner				/					/								/									3
22 soleil																	/									1
23 jeune																	/	/								2
24 à peu pres																	/									1
25 jeudi																	/									1
26 minute			/				/										/									3
27 musique			/				/										/									3
28 emprunte							/										/									2
29 brin																										0
30 anglais							/										/		/							3
31 francais							/										/									2
	3	0	0	7	3	0	0	17	1	0	5	0	0	13	6	2	22	3	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	90

Unlike Labov's study where he found that certain features were indicated with great regularity, no pattern emerged in the present study. It can be seen on Table 4 that there are no significant trends in the words which informants articulate differently from their stated pronunciation, nor is there consistency in the individual scores.

The number of items which individuals incorrectly perceive as their own pronunciations range from zero to twenty-two. Therefore, if in terms of the 'self evaluation' test, these figures represent indices on each informant's 'index of linguistic insecurity', there is no one index which is representative of the entire group.

The reason for this was that the majority of informants did not recognize standard French pronunciation as the 'correct' form, thus negating the hypothesis that this would be the case. In fact, a large number of informants expressed extreme negative judgements about standard French such as "l'accent de la France m'énervé", "je déteste l'accent de la France".

The two exceptions to the above were the two informants who had the highest scores; twenty-two and seventeen. Their comments, "le français de France est mieux que le nôtre" and "je voudrais bien parler le français de France car il a vraiment une façon chic d'être interprété ... c'est pourquoi je voudrais et je vais l'apprendre" show that these informants believe that standard French is the more 'correct' variety and their linguistic insecurity is reflected in the high number of pronunciations which they wrongly indicate as their own.

The next score in descending order was thirteen. However, the informant with this score rejected the notion that there is a 'correct' way of speaking. There are two possible reasons why this score is high without the informant being overtly insecure. The first is that she may well subconsciously accept standard French as the 'correct' prestige form and therefore believe that she articulates the thirteen items that way. However, this is unlikely. The second reason

is that since the thirteen items are the first thirteen and not one thereafter, it seems possible that the informant did not understand the instructions of the test.

It can be seen that two of the three informants with high scores are linguistically insecure, whereas the degree of insecurity of the third is dubious.

An interesting parallel can be found in the responses of these three informants to the words 'rempart', 'entame' and 'phare'. Although most informants indicated that they articulate these words in the same way as the Québec speaker, these were the three words which all twenty-five informants articulated differently from the Québec speaker. A minority indicated that they articulated these words in the standard French way; five for 'rempart', three for 'entame' and three for 'phare'. The three informants who indicated 'rempart' and 'phare' were the informants with the highest scores, and this was the same for 'entame' as they were three of the five who indicated the standard French option.

It is also interesting, that since neither option was characteristic of the speech of any of the informants, all the others indicated the Québec French pronunciation as representative of their own. This must be due to the fact that they dislike standard French pronunciation.

The question of the three words for which no option represents the pronunciation of the informants bears on a methodological downfall in the test. Had a pilot study been conducted in Amos (or even phonological analyses of the speech of informants) it would have been detected that the replacement of /ɔ/ for /a/ was not characteristic of the pronunciation of Amos informants, and therefore not relevant to the aims of

the study.⁹

It would seem also that a theoretical discrepancy underlies that fact that only two informants showed signs of real linguistic insecurity.

Where Labov's findings showed that New Yorkers detected certain stigmatized features with great regularity and demonstrated close agreement in the recognition of prestige markers, he was able to conclude that New Yorkers are governed by a norm which monitors the perception of their speech. "The audio-monitoring norm is the form which is perceived by the speaker himself as he speaks. He does not hear the actual sound he produces but the norm he imposes." ¹⁰

As this was not the case in the present study it seems possible that this test is only valid in a highly socially stratified society where language plays a fundamental role in social identification.

This test was originally selected because standard French was identified by previous researchers as the prestige form. Findings similar to those of Labov's New York city study were anticipated. This did not happen and it can be attributed to the fact that the informants do not see standard French as the 'correct' prestigious variety, and are therefore not linguistically insecure in this regard.

2. PART B2: LEXICAL TEST OF LINGUISTIC INSECURITY

1. Aims and Method

The second test in the survey of attitudes was lexical. It too, was based on the principles of Labov's 'self evaluation' test.

It was assumed that if subject's reactions to phonetic stimuli revealed a level of insecurity to language, lexical items should also reveal these reactions and enable the determination of the respondent's evaluation of his own lexical usage.

The original test developed by Labov was modified so that instead of asking the informant which pronunciation he used and checking it against his actual pronunciation to obtain an index of linguistic insecurity, the informant was asked to indicate which word he would use in a given context and this was checked against his real usage.

This was done by giving the informant a series of open-ended questions and asking him to complete the sentences with the word or words that he would use in a particular context. At the same time, the informant was asked to indicate whether the word he used was of Québec, standard French, English or other origin. This diverted attention from the task in hand, and also showed whether he was aware that a variant word existed. In a following individual interview, the informant was asked the same questions in a colloquial spoken manner to determine whether his responses in the questionnaire were the same as he used in an informal spoken situation. The interviewer adopted a colloquial style and changed the sentence slightly to make the situation less formal. For instance, the sentence "Pour dormir, un homme met un pyjama et une femme met un/une ..." was changed to "toi, qu'est-ce-que tu mets pour dormir" during an interview with a female informant who had completed the former sentence with the standard French word.

A list of words used exclusively in Québec French, and standard French words which have a different usage in Québec French was drawn-up. The words were selected by two means:

- (i) my own knowledge of lexical variations of Québec French.
- (ii) Le petit dictionnaire du joual au français.

The sentences were derived from these words which are shown on the table below.

TABLE 5: LEXICAL ITEMS UNDER STUDY

Standard French word (SF)	Quebec French variant (QF)	Origin of variant
bureau de tabac	tabagie	SF word used differently
aiguilles	broches	SF Word used differently
chemise de nuit	jacquette	QF innovation
weekend	fin-de-semaine	QF translation for 'week-end'
boîtes aux lettres	boîte à malle	Calque of 'mailbox'
coffre-fort	safe	English borrowing
faire du shopping	faire du magasinage	QF innovation from the noun
épargner) sauver	Calque of 'to save'
gagner		
poser	demander	Calque of 'to ask'
présenter	introduire	Calque of 'introduce'
faire de l'autostop	faire du pouce	Translation of American English 'to thumb a ride'
ennuyeux	plate	Calque of 'flat'
amusant	le fun	English borrowing
timide	gêné	SF word used differently

A pilot study was conducted at EPSCI in Paris. The students were each given the questionnaire with the same instructions that were given later to the French Canadians.

All of the twenty students indicated the same word for each question, that is, in every sentence they inserted the standard French word in the left hand column of the above table. Although this exercise did not show how an index of linguistic insecurity would work, it established that the meaning of word sought was clear.

2. Results and discussion

The aim of this test was to determine the informant's evaluation of his own lexical usage. The data collected during two sessions is presented below.

The hypothesis that a high level of insecurity would be identified was not confirmed. However, certain results, particularly in comparison with the pilot study which will be discussed subsequently, illuminate sensitive aspects of the question of a Canadian French lexicon, and attitudes towards it.

Table 6 shows the scores for the twenty-five informants. Column one gives the figures for the ratio of Québec French lexical items to standard French lexical items in the first session, and column two is the ratio for the second interview. The ratios are also given for nouns, verbs and adjectives. The third column shows the number of items which were different in first and second interviews. The last two columns give details of the words changed by informants, and deviations from the standard pattern of response which was identified as being a ratio of ten Québec French words to five standard French words.

TABLE 6: RESULTS OF LEXICAL QUESTIONS

Name of Informant	1st Interview					2nd Interview					Index of L.I.	Items changed, QF variant in 2nd Interview	Deviations from 10/5 trend
	QF	SF	Noun	Verb	Adj	QF	SF	Noun	Verb	Adj			
			QF/SF					QF/SF					
Manon Arcand	9	6	4/2	1/4	3/0	9	6						aiguilles
Sylvie Baulne	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	10	5						3 adjectives
Daniel Bechard	7	8	5/1	2/4	0/3	7	8						
M.C. Bergeron	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	10	5						robe de nuit, l'autstop
Guylaine Bisson	5	10	4/2	1/5	0/3	5	10						boîte aux lettres, adjectives
Gilles Boutin	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	10	5						
Nancy Delcambre	9	6	4/2	2/4	3/0	9	6						boîte aux lettres
M.P. Desbiens	3	12	2/4	1/5	0/3	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	7	jackette, broches, boîte à malle, pouce, 3 adjectives	
Josée Dominique	9	6	5/1	2/4	2/1	9	6						timide
Manon Duhaime	9	6	5/1	2/4	2/1	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	1	gêné	
Josée Fontaine	9	6	4/2	2/4	3/0	9	6						magasin
Lyne Gaulin	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	10	5						
Eliane Gervais	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	10	5						
Chantal Goyette	7	8	5/1	2/4	0/3	7	8						3 adjectives
Martin Lacombe	8	7	5/1	1/5	2/1	9	6	5/1	1/5	3/0	1	gêné	shopping
Annie Lanoix	7	8	5/1	2/4	0/3	7	8						3 adjectives
Nathalie Laroche	9	6	4/2	2/4	3/0	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	1	boîte à malle	
Christine L'écuyer	3	12	1/5	1/5	1/2	9	6	4/2	2/4	3/0	6	jackette, fin de semaine boîte à malle, le fun, gêné	aiguilles
Richard Lefebvre	9	6	5/1	1/5	3/0	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	1	magasinage	
Lise Rodrique	9	6	5/1	1/5	3/0	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	1	gêné	
M. Rouillier	6	9	4/2	1/5	1/2	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	4	jackette, du pouce, plate, gêné	
Christine Simard	8	7	4/2	1/5	3/0	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	2	tabagie, magasinage	
Celine Tremblay	6	9	4/2	1/5	1/2	6	9						robe de nuit, aiguilles, l'autstop, 3 adjectives
Manon Trepanier	11	4	6/0	2/4	3/0	11	4						
René Vachon	10	5	5/1	2/4	3/0	10	5						

The above table shows that nine informants change their responses in the second interview. The figures are found in the column labelled "Index of linguistic insecurity". It can be seen that five informants changed one item, and the remaining four each changed a different number: 2, 4, 6 and 7. Although the test was based on the notion that those who change their responses from one interview to the next show signs of linguistic insecurity, this must be discussed with caution as the results in isolation are not very convincing.

In comparison to the pilot study where the results were homogeneous over the entire group, it seems possible that the tendency to alter original responses found in the French Canadian test does suggest that these informants are linguistically insecure. Still, this is doubtful. An examination of some of the trends will show why.

Not one informant uses all Québec French words. The highest ratio of Québec French words to standard French words is eleven to four. The four lexical items which were given in standard French by this informant are the four verbs, 'épargner, gagner, poser, presenter'. In fact, not one informant uses a Québec variant for these verbs. The most common ratio and the next on a descending scale of Québec French to standard French is ten to five which is the score for thirteen informants. The five standard French words include one noun, 'coffre-fort' and the four above named verbs. With such a high percentage (100%) using the standard French form of verbs, it can be deduced that this would be regular usage, and therefore the study of them is not relevant to the aims of the 'self evaluation' test which contrasts lexical variants.

The next ratio of Québec French to standard French is nine to six. The six standard French words all include the four verbs, 'coffre-fort' and varied individual words which can be found in the far right column of the above table. Following this, the ratio of seven Québec French words to eight standard French is the score for three informants. As above, the standard French words are, 'coffre-fort', four verbs, and in addition, the three adjectives; 'timide', 'ennuyeux' and 'amusant'.

Finally, the two lowest ratios of Québec French to standard French are five to ten and six to nine. No patterns emerge for these scores.

Certain patterns do emerge for other scores which show down-falls in the test. For instance, six of the nine informants have the same word 'gêné' as one of the corrections. However, this is only significant in that it shows that both 'gêné' and 'timide' which denote the same thing in Québec French and standard French respectively are words which the French Canadians know. It is not so clear that they are aware that 'gêné' is used differently in standard French. For this reason, it hardly seems fair to say that changing 'timide' in the first interview to 'gêné' in the second is a sign of linguistic insecurity. The test is based on the notion that those who hypercorrect using a more prestigious variant are linguistically insecure. This necessarily infers that the informant knows both the common word and the prestigious variant.

The findings of this test have shown that this is not the case. For instance, in the first sentence, 'On achète

le tabac et les jouhaux au/à la ...', not one informant uses 'bureau de tabac' which is the standard French word. All informants say either 'tabagie' or 'dépanneur', and they are not aware that these words do not denote the same thing in standard French. Perhaps a better format for the test would have been to have multi-choice questions so that all the variants would be offered.

The above points, among others not listed here, make one wary of the value of the results in labelling those informants who change from first to second interviews as linguistically insecure. The response pattern for question 4 illuminates this. In the first interview twenty-two informants inserted 'fin de semaine', and three inserted 'weekend'. In the second interview, all twenty-five put the Québec French variant, followed by comments such as 'it is more French than 'weekend' '.

In conclusion, the relative failure of this test can be paralleled to the phonetic test. If standard French is not the prestige norm, then it must be concluded that this test does not work in the French Canadian context.

3. PART B3: ATTITUDE SCALE

1. Aims and method

This final part of the sociolinguistic survey was designed to examine linguistic attitudes on the conscious level. The aim was to establish whether the prediction that French Canadians are linguistically insecure as a result of their language being second to English on political and

economic levels, and standard French on a linguistic level, was valid. Lambert et al. have shown this to be the case in the past. However, many of their tests were with bilingual students and attitudes were not examined overtly. All choices made by the informants were unconscious judgements as they were not aware what was being tested. The method developed by Lambert served its purpose to analyse some attitudes towards linguistic variation. It is true that attitudes towards certain linguistic features cannot be put into meaningful terms by an informant and therefore tests had to be developed in order to translate the underlying attitudes.

Nevertheless, although adequate in some ways, the 'subjective reaction' technique has many loopholes. There is no way of knowing whether an informant is basing his decision on specifically linguistic variables incorporated in the test text; namely, phonological, grammatical, syntactic or lexical, or whether he is making judgements according to sexual chauvinism, favouring a male speaker over a female speaker for a high status job, or preferring a sombre tone of voice over a jovial one. In short, can one be entirely certain that subjects are judging the criteria which the researcher has hoped he will? No! In many attitude studies of this nature, the findings may indeed be convincing, such as Labov's projects where one phonological variable is isolated, but where extra-linguistic notions such as different languages are the object of attitudinal study, it is doubtful. 'Extra-linguistic' in this context means languages in relation to one another, and their role in career, education and other social categories.

For the above reasons, a completely independent approach was adopted in the present study to examine attitudes.

This is a scale named after its inventor, Likert, which is used commonly in sociological research.

In order to measure such intangible things as attitudes, a scale must be constructed to subjectively assess the degree of presence of an attitude.

The Likert scale is made up of a series of statements which require the informant to speculate. They are not statements which force the informant to report on the truth or falsify the facts as these would fit into cognitive measurement. In response to a given statement, the informant checks the option that most closely represents his feeling about the statement. Normally, five options are given: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. In the present study, the middle "undecided" category has been left out to insure that all responses will reflect a directional opinion.

The reason why this method was selected was because it enables one to examine the full range of attitudes which constitute the global attitude under study. In this case, where the aim was to measure attitudes towards the language situation in Québec, both social and psychological factors had to be considered, as well as the presence of other varieties of Québec French, standard French, and English.

The first step in constructing a 'Likert' scale is to define a topical outline, that is, the areas towards which attitudes will be measured and then to subdivide them into relevant statements. The questionnaire developed for the present survey was made up of nineteen statements. The categories below serve as an outline of topics contained within the global attitude:

- 1) relative superiority of standard French (statement No. 1, 8, 14, 18)
- 2) relative superiority of English (2, 10, 16)
- 3) relative inferiority of 'joual' (6, 13)
- 4) level of education (15)
- 5) career stereotypes (4, 9, 12)
- 6) social styles (3, 11)
- 7) accent judgement/linguistic insecurity (5, 7, 17, 19)

Thus, attitudes towards the language situation in Québec are defined as being the collective result of attitudes towards the above topics. Selection of these topical areas was based on two things: firstly, personal intuition, as a result of my stay in Canada; and secondly, on those elements which have been identified by previous researchers as being sensitive areas in the attitudes of French Canadians towards their language.

As this scale was only pertinent in a French Canadian situation, it could not be tested in the pilot studies conducted in France. The original scale was made up of twenty-four statements. After the test, five were eliminated as they treated features of language which were relative to cognitive rather than attitudinal aspects.¹²

2. Results

Scoring a Likert scale is as follows: for statements which are positively phrased in favour of Québec French a numerical value is assigned to each option descending from highest to lowest on the scale, strongly agree to strongly disagree (SA = 4, A = 3, SD = 2, D = 1); for negative

statements the highest value is assigned to the negative end of the scale (SA = 1, A = 2, SD = 3, D = 4).

The following table shows the scores for each statement, as well as the topical area it belongs to, and overlaps where they occur.

TABLE 7: REAL AND AVERAGE SCORES FOR ATTITUDE SCALE

Statement	EA	A	P	PA	Positive	Negative	Score	Category	Related Statements	Average
1	11	11	3	-	✓		83	A	-	3.32
2	2	8	10	5		✓	68	B	-	2.72
3	4	8	7	6	✓		67	F	G	2.68
4	-	7	6	18		✓	97	E	-	3.68
5	9	11	4	1		✓	47	G	-	7.88
6	2	3	11	9	✓		48	C	-	7.92
7	17	5	-	3	✓		86	G	-	3.44
8	3	8	12	2	✓		62	A	F	2.48
9	8	8	6	3		✓	61	E	C	2.44
10	3	9	9	4		✓	64	B	E	2.56
11	4	12	9	-	✓		70	F	A/C	2.80
12	13	6	4	2	✓		80	E	G(7)	3.20
13	7	3	7	14		✓	84	C	-	3.36
14	2	5	8	10		✓	76	A	-	3.04
15	14	16	5	-	✓		74	D	A	2.96
16	5	8	10	2		✓	59	B	-	2.36
17	9	11	3	2	✓		77	G	-	3.08
18	-	5	10	10		✓	80	A	-	3.20
19	14	10	1	-	✓		80	G	-	3.52

Key: Relative superiority of standard French (A)
 Relative superiority of English (B)
 Relative inferiority of 'joul' (C)
 Level of education (D)
 Career stereotypes (E)
 Social styles (F)
 Linguistic insecurity (G)

Simple statistical tests were conducted to determine whether the responses to statements within each category were correlated, and also to establish whether responses to similar statements from different categories corresponded with one another.¹¹

(1) Relative superiority of standard French

The averages for the four statements in this category give an average of 3.01 (1/3.32; 8/2.48; 14/3.04; 18/3.20) . This figure represents a refusal to accept standard French as being superior to Québec French. In question one, the responses show that 88% of the informants agree with the statement that Québec French is as valuable as standard French. Of this number, half commit themselves to total agreement. Only 12%, that is three informants, do not agree, and even then disagreement is not extreme. Statements 14 and 18 which propose the same thing as statement 1, only differently worded, yield similar results. 72% disagree with statement 14 which proposes that the French spoken in France is better than the French in Canada. This statement is negatively phrased with regard to Québec French, therefore, disagreement indicates a favourable attitude to this variety. Similarly, statement 18 is negatively phrased and the majority response of disagreement, 80%, shows a positive attitude. The further 20% who agree with this statement do not indicate "strongly agree". Statement 8 which has the lowest average (2.48) touches on the question of standard French superiority from a different angle. It proposes that a French Canadian who speaks with a standard French accent seems pretentious. 40% of the informants agree and 56% disagree. These figures correlate well with the responses to

statements in the category of accent judgement.

In general, the majority of informants favour Québec French over standard French. The average score of 3.01 supports this conclusion. Furthermore, if the average of the three statements dealing specifically with the question of standard French in relation to Québec French are taken, it becomes 3.18, higher, and therefore a more positive attitude to Québec French.

(2) Relative superiority of English

Three statements relate to the relative superiority of English: 2, 10 and 16. The average for each statement respectively is 2.72, 2.56,^{and} 2.36, and the average over the three is 2.54.

Since French and English cannot be compared in the same way as standard French and Québec French, because the former pair are different languages, the statements necessarily place English in a particular situation. Statements 2 and 16 deal with the relationship between English and French in a nation dominated by English, and statement 10 treats English as a utilitarian language. It can be seen from the average of 2.54 that the informants' responses are generally non-committal. In statement 2, five informants strongly agree that it is better to speak English than French in Canada, and only two strongly disagree. For statement 10, four strongly agree that one must speak English to get a better job, while three strongly disagree. Similarly, the extremes in statement 16 are minimal. For all the statements in this category, the majority of responses are between mild agreement and disagreement. Although there is recognition that English is a useful language in Canada, informants do not believe that it is superior to French.

(3) Relative inferiority of 'Joual'

Although only two statements examine this item; 6 and 13, two others also deal with 'joual' in relation to other varieties. However, the two principal statements are so different that each one will be discussed, rather than the average of the two. Statement six which proposes that a 'joual' speaker comes across as less intelligent has an average of 1.92, showing that there is general disagreement. This correlates with statement 7 which received a high average agreeing that one should not be judged by one's accent. (Av = 3.44). Statement 13, that all French Canadians should speak 'joual' was totally rejected. The average of 3.36 shows this.

(4) Level of Education

The average score of 2.96 for the one statement in this category shows that there is general agreement that someone who speaks well appears to be more educated. This must be related to the statement about accent judgement. (Statement 7) Although the scores do not correlate, this does not undermine the responses to statement 7. It is generally accepted in any language that the better educated are the better speakers (and its corollary); if one is to make judgements about accent, this group only is praised. Whereas, if one talks about accents including the whole range of social, regional or other, judgements and opinions are often made about speakers. It is those speakers with the so called unprestigious accent who are judged negatively. The statement referring to accent judgement carries these undertones, rather than judgement about speakers of prestigious varieties.

(5) Career Stereotypes

The average for the three statements in this category is 3.10. Although the general attitude is that accent should not be considered as a criterion for employment, nor should it be the basis for salary considerations, the informants' attitude to which variety of language one should speak during an interview is not so definite. The score for statement 9 is 2.44 showing that the informants have not committed themselves to any extremes of opinion on this aspect.

(6) Social Styles

The scores for statements 3 and 11 show the awareness that social styles exist. In both cases, there are few extremes of opinion. The average for the two, 2.74, shows that on the scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', there is reserved agreement. However, in interpreting the attitudes in this category, it must be recognised that the statements deal more with instinctive beliefs than conscious attitudes. It is common knowledge that it would be better to speak in good French rather than 'joul', but as the informants in this study are not 'joul' speakers, it is an issue which does not concern them directly.

(7) Accent Judgement/Linguistic Insecurity

This notion has been discussed previously as it overlaps with other items towards which attitudes are examined. In most cases, the scores have been consistent with those found here. Statement 7, "On ne doit pas être jugé à cause de son accent" has an average score of 3.44 which shows that the large majority of informants strongly agree with it. The other three statements in this category pertain more to the question

of linguistic insecurity. 17 and 19 which relate to the Québec accent and the individual's accent respectively both have high average scores; 3.08 and 3.52. With few exceptions, the informants are proud of their accents and give no indication of linguistic insecurity. However, the situation is different with statement five, "je dois améliorer ma façon de parler". 80% believe that they should improve, 16% disagree and 4% strongly disagree.

It is possible that the informants interpreted this statement as meaning an improvement in other features of speech such as grammar and lexical items rather than just accent.

(8) Summary

The main points which have emerged from the results of the Likert scale are that the twenty-five Amos informants are linguistically secure and certainly feel no need to improve their pronunciation. They view Québec French in a favourable way and will not accept that standard French is any better. As for English, although they recognize that it would be valuable to know it to widen career prospects, they do not rank it above Québec French on any level. The majority are also adamant that 'joual' speakers should not be judged negatively because of their accent, and this generalizes to their opinion that accent should never be a criterion for judgement about a speaker's personality, level of intelligence or other factors. However, the informants do not believe that all French Canadians should speak 'joual'.

These findings compare well with those of the two earlier attitude surveys. In the 'self evaluation' tests it was evident that standard French was not a prestige norm which

informants were striving to attain, and this was confirmed by their responses to statements on the attitude scale.

However, as in the preceding surveys, there were downfalls in the attitude scale. These have been mentioned in the summary of each category, where it was shown that four statements were ambiguous. These were: statement 15 which treated attitudes towards the relationship between language and education; statements 3 and 11 which related to social styles; and statement 5 which proposed that the informant should improve his speech. The responses to these statements did not correlate with other responses in the same category. This was largely due to the fact that these statements treated intuitive beliefs rather than attitudes themselves, or that particular variables were not isolated. This discrepancy is the basis of the whole argument about attitude measurement and which method is best.

4. Synthesis and critical discussion of the three attitude surveys

The indications of the present study are that the value of identifying language attitudes and how to measure them, particularly in the context of Amos, is questionable.

Evaluative reactions towards speakers of various languages or dialects have been widely studied using a number of techniques during the last twenty years.

Since Lambert et. al. originally developed the 'matched-guise' technique for comparing reactions to two languages, adapted forms have been employed to assess biases toward different varieties of the same language, as in Preston's survey of reactions to Canadian French and European French.

Labov pioneered a technique to measure individual reactions toward isolated phonological and phonetic variables based on the assumption that speech communities share a common set of value-judgements.

Finally, attitudes to language have been studied using techniques borrowed from sociology and psychology, such as semantic-differential and Likert scales.

Two of the above methods were selected to examine attitudes in the present study: (i) Labov's 'self-evaluation' test; (ii) a Likert scale.

It has been seen that the first of these surveys did not work in the context of Amos, primarily because standard French was not the prestige norm. One could, in interpreting the results, take the opposite view that the findings indicate that informants are very linguistically secure but this evidence would be anecdotal. It is the writer's observation that the 'success' of this test relies too much on the impressionistic statements made by informants when asked which of two language varieties is 'correct'.

The reason for discrediting some of the findings of the Likert scale are slightly different. It was originally selected as one of two possible attitude measures of language in general. The other, Lambert's 'matched-guise' technique was not used as the results leave one in doubt as to which variables subjects are reacting. However, employment of a Likert scale in the present study has shown that ambiguities of this nature can also arise. This does not necessarily undermine the system of analysis itself, but rather, questions whether a linguist should use methods from other disciplines such as sociology and psychology, without proper training.

This conclusion was also upheld by Bloch and Trager:

" ... feelings about language ... are inaccessible to investigation by techniques of linguistic science ... The linguist is concerned solely with the facts of speech. The psychological correlates of these facts are undoubtedly important; but the linguist has no means ... as a linguist ... of analysing them." 12

Martinet also shares these views:

"The linguist will feel competent to deal with the latter (structural aspects of language) but he may be excused if, in his capacity as a linguist he declines the invitation to investigate sociological conditioning." 13

As an academic exercise, the attitude surveys have been extremely rewarding. They have on the one hand, shown some interesting aspects of the French Canadian language question; and on the other hand, they have witnessed how difficult it is to identify and measure attitudes to language.

NOTES

1. Labov, W. Sociolinguistic patterns, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972, p. 133
2. Cf. Chapter II. 3
3. Male voice productions were also made, but the tone and pitch of each speaker's voice differed too greatly for the recordings to be used in the test.
4. Two of the four students were from Montpellier, and one was from Normandy; characteristic traits of the regional dialects of these areas were evident in their speech.
5. Christine Signolles (EPSCI - Paris); Jean Bernier; Chantal Leclerc (University of Ottawa)
6. Cf. Chapter II. 2
7. Genouvrier, E. and Peytard, J. Linguistique et enseignement du français, Larousse, 1970. p. 40
8. The nasal phonemes are discussed in great detail by Léon. Cf. Chapter II. 3 of this report.
9. The phonological analysis conducted at the same time as this sociolinguistic test did show that the informants clearly distinguish /ɔ/ and /ɑ/. Cf. Chapter VI. 2
10. Labov, W. The social stratification of English in New York City, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966. p. 455
11. Tests for correlating responses involved taking the number of responses to each category, and for each statement and matching them with the same for another statement. These were plotted on graphs where the 'x' axis represented one statement and the 'y' axis, the other. Binomial distribution formulae were applied to show that if at least 20 out of 25 responses correlated, then this was not due to chance.
12. Bloch and Trager, cited by Labov, The Social Stratification of English in New York city, p. 10
13. Martinet, A., cited by Labov, loc.cit

CHAPTER VI

PHONOLOGICAL STUDY

1. DETAILS OF THE TEST

The purpose of this study was to examine the unstable vowel phonemes in the speech of each informant in order to define individual phonological systems, and to identify any trends for the entire group.

Based on the questionnaire format developed by Walter, phonological oppositions were examined in two ways. A minimal pair word list comprising twelve phonological oppositions and a reading text including nine phonemic contrasts were used to elicit the required information. The informant was given the list and asked to indicate whether he articulated the two words of the minimal pair identically. At the same time, he was asked to read the pairs aloud. This allowed the fieldworker to determine whether the informant's rendering of his own pronunciation was correct. Following this, the informant was taped reading the text.

It has already been seen that Walter not only refined the research techniques of her predecessors Martinet, Reichstein and Deyhime, but also developed an inventory of all the unstable phonological oppositions which exist in French.¹

Items were selected from this list for examination in the present study. In addition, three phonological contrasts which seemed to be possible points of confusion in Québec French were tested: /ɔ / ~ /a/, /ǎ / ~ /æ /, /ē / ~ /ǎ /.²

(1) The phonemes under study

1. Open vowels: This question aims to determine whether the subject makes a distinction between the front non-rounded phoneme /a/ and the back rounded phoneme /ɑ/.

Final open position: bas - bat, mois - moi

Final enclosed position: patte - pâte, mâle - mal

Non-final position: bateau - bâton.

2. Mid-open vowels; Front non-rounded: This question examines phonemic oppositions of length and timbre. It aims to determine whether the informant makes a distinction between semi-closed /e/ and semi-open /ɛ/.

Final open position: aimé - aimait, pré - prêt, fée - fait.

Similarly, it aims to establish whether the /ɛ/ phoneme in enclosed syllables is lengthened in one word of a minimal pair to distinguish the two words.

Final enclosed position: maître - mètre, belle - bête.

Finally, the phonemes in final open position are examined in armé - armée to determine whether a distinction of timbre or length is made.

3. Mid-open vowels; Front rounded: This question aims to show if a distinction is made between the mid-closed phoneme /ø/ and the mid-open phoneme /œ/. This opposition occurs only in final enclosed position.

Final enclosed position: jeune - jeûne, feuilles - feutrés.

4. Mid-open back vowels: The aim of this question is to determine whether the informant makes a distinction between /ɔ/ and /o/.

Final enclosed position: pomme - paume

One further minimal pair is examined to determine whether the

informant makes any distinction between the vowels in final position of the following pair.

Final open position: pot - peau.

5. Mid-open vowels: This question is included to test the status of the phonemic opposition of the two open phonemes /ɔ/ and /œ/.

Final enclosed position: sol - seul.

6. Back vowels: The aim of this question is to examine the informants' articulation of the phonemes /ɔ/ and /a/ to determine whether they are distinguished.

Final enclosed position: port - part, fort - phare.

7. Mute "e": The aim of this question is to establish the timbre of mute "e" by testing whether the /ɔ/ is realized as /ø/, /œ/ or between those two phonemes.

8. Correlation of length: This question examines the informants' articulation of contrasting vowel phonemes to determine whether they are distinguished by length of delivery.

Final open position: armé - armée, peu - peux.

9. Nasal vowels: The object of this question is to determine whether distinctions are made between certain nasal vowel phonemes.

/ɛ/~ /œ/: brin - brun, empreinte - emprunte

/ã/~ /œ/: encadre - un cadre

/ɛ/~ /ã/: étain - étang.

2. RESULTS

The phonological vowel systems of 25 informants are shown below, followed by explanatory notes.

The systems were deduced from the informants' answers to questions on the pronunciation of minimal pairs, notes taken by myself in phonetic transcript of their actual pronunciation, and examination of the tapes of the informant reading the text.

The presentation in table form was developed by Walter in Enquête phonologique et variétés régionales du français,³ and has been adapted to the conditions of this survey. Whereas Walter's tables represent in each case an idiolect, these here present the characteristics of the pronunciation of a particular speaker, based on the examination of only a few minimal pairs for each phonological opposition. Although Walter's study of the speech of each informant is comprehensive and dozens of minimal pairs are tested, she is careful to note that one should be wary of the fixed value which presentation in the form of a table apparently gives. For this reason, she explains selected idiolects in detail.

In this study, the tables are followed in each case by descriptions of the articulation of each phonological opposition.

(1) Conventions

The vowel phonemes are displayed in three tables: two for the oral vowels (final open and final enclosed positions), and one for the nasal vowels.

The symbolic conventions detailed below are the same as those used by Walter.⁴

- phonemes are represented by symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabet.

- stable phonological oppositions are separated by dark horizontal and vertical lines.
 - unstable oppositions are separated by wavy lines.
 - diagonal lines represent a distinction in the length of the vowel.
- ː beside a letter represents a clear lengthening of the vowel
- ˙ beside a letter represents a slight lengthening of the vowel.
- ˘ under a letter marks a more closed vowel
- ɔ under a letter marks a more open vowel.
- oː above a letter marks a more rounded vowel.
- ˘ above a letter marks a vowel which is particularly brief.
- ˜ above a letter indicates nasality.
- /øⁱ/, /ɛ^e/, etc. a phonetic symbol in smaller script at the above right of the letter represents diphthongization.
- () brackets around a letter indicate that the phoneme in question is rarely realized.

In Walter's inventory of notational conventions, she indicates that phonetic symbols printed in italics represent an intermediary timbre. This has been omitted in the present study. The existence of an opposition of timbre is shown by horizontal lines (for the distinctive trait of open/closed), and vertical lines (back/front). This is sufficient to mark the status of an opposition.

(2) Charts and commentary

HANON ARCAND 06/12/66 Quebec.
 Origin of father : Abitibi.
 Origin of mother : Cantons de l'est.
 Years in Amos : 0. Other towns : Oka.
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Professional.

i	y	u
ẽ e	ø	õ
ɛ ε	ø	o
	a	

i ɪ	y ʏ	u ʊ
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ẽj ẽj	ã ã	õ õ
ã		

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi : No distinction is made between back /ɑ/ and front /a/ in 'bas' and 'bat' respectively. However, 'mois' is articulated as /mwa/ and 'moi' as /mwa/.

peau/pot : The timbre of the vowels in those words is identical. The phoneme articulated is a closed /o/, but the length of the /õ/ in 'pot' is shorter than the /o/ of 'peau'.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A definite difference can be detected in the informant's pronunciation of the minimal pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with an open /ɛ/ phoneme, and a variant of closed /e/ is articulated in the second word. The variant /e/ is more closing and tends towards /i/.

peu/peux : 'Peux' is articulated with a closed /ø/ phoneme that is marginally shorter than the /ø/ phoneme of 'peu'.

armé/armée : The /ẽ/ of 'armée' is slightly longer than in the first word of the minimal pair.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'patte' and 'mal', and a back /ɑ/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.
 pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained. Rather than the open /ɔ/ of 'sol' approaching the phoneme /œ/, it becomes more open, /sɔl/.

port/part;fort/phare: A clear distinction is made between the vowel phonemes in these minimal pairs.
 jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés: An open /œ/ phoneme articulated in the first words of each pair distinguishes them from 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' which are articulated with a closed /ø/ phoneme. mètre/maître;bêlé/belle: An unstable opposition exists between the phonemic articulation of the above words. In the minimal pairs section of the interview, the informant articulates 'mètre/maître' identically as /mɛtʁ/ and 'belle' /bɛl/ and 'bêlé' /bɛ:l/ differently. In the taped extract, the opposition is again not made, both 'mètre' and 'maître' are articulated with an unlengthened open /ɛ/ phoneme.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte: The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /ɛ̃/ and a consonant appendix /ɲ/, and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. The nasal vowel of 'empreinte' is diphthongized so that it is articulated as /ɛ̃/ and 'emprunte' is articulated with a clear /œ̃/ nasal phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre: The nasal vowel phoneme of 'un' is the same as above, 'un' /œ̃/ and 'encadre' is articulated with a back nasalised /ɑ̃/.

étain/étang: This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ɛ̃/ and a nasal consonant appendix and 'étang' with the nasal phoneme /ɑ̃/.

SILVIE BAULNE

20/03/67

Amos.

Origin of father : St. Dominique du Rosaire.

Origin of mother : Amos.

Years in Amos : 16. Other towns : -

Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Computer.

i	y	u
e ^h	ø	O
ε	φ	
ε̃		
ε̃		
	a	

i	y	u
ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ε	ø	o
ε:	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ẽj	ẽ	õ
ẽ	ã	ãj

ORAL VOWELS Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi : Both the 'a' phonemes of the minimal pairs are articulated as front /a/.

peau/pot : Both words are articulated with a closed /o/ phoneme.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : This phonological opposition is unstable in the speech of this informant. Definite distinctions are made between the 'e' phonemes of the minimal pairs, but the nature of the articulation changes. 'Fait' is pronounced with a phoneme variant that tends towards closed /e/, and the 'e' of 'fée' is more closed and diphthongized so that it becomes /fɛj/. Open /ε/ is articulated in 'aimait' and 'prêt', while a closed variant tending towards /i/ is articulated in 'aimé' and 'pré'.

peu/peux : Although the informant states that she articulates these words identically, this is not the case. The /ø/ of 'peux' is shorter than it is in 'peu'.

armé/armée : The /e/ of 'armée' is articulated in exactly the same manner as the final vowel phoneme of 'armée'.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'patte' and 'mal', and a back /a/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pom/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : An open /œ/ phoneme articulated in the first words of each pair distinguish them from 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' which are articulated with a closed /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître;bête/belle : The informant says that she articulates the words of the first pair above identically, and the second pair differently. This is verified on the tape. 'Mètre' and 'maître' are articulated as /metr/, while 'belle' is pronounced /bɛl/, and 'bête' as /bɛ:l/.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /œ/ consonant appendix /ɲ/, and 'brun' as /brœ/. The nasal vowel of 'empreinte' is articulated as /ɛ̃/ differentiating it from 'emprunte' which is articulated with a clear /œ/ nasal phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : The nasal vowel phoneme of 'un' is the same as above, 'un' /œ̃/ and 'encadre' is articulated with a back nasalised /ɑ̃/. étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ɛ̃/ and a nasal consonant appendix and 'étang' with the nasal phoneme /ɑ̃/ and a nasal consonant appendix segment.

DIANEL BECHARD 19/12/66 Amos.
 Origin of father : Amos
 Origin of mother : Amos.
 Years in Amos : 12. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Administration.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ		(ɔ)
	a	

ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ	œ	ɔ
	a	ɑ

ẽ	œ̃	ɔ̃
ẽ	œ̃	ɔ̃
ã		

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi : Both the 'a' phonemes of the minimal pairs are articulated as front /a/.

peau/pot : These two words are pronounced differently. 'Peau' with a closed /o/ phoneme, and 'pot' with an anglicized variant, [pɔ̃].

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré : Distinction is made between the vowel phonemes of all three minimal pairs tested in this position. Open /ɛ/ is articulated in the first words of each pair and a closing variant of /e/ is articulated in the second word of each pair.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically.

armé/armée : The /e/ of 'armée' is articulated in exactly the same way as the final vowel phoneme of 'armee'.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte; mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'patte' and 'mal', and a back /ɑ/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as [pɔ̃m] and 'paume' as [pɔ̃m].

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés : An open /œ/ phoneme articulated in the first words of each pair distinguishes them from 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' which are articulated with a closed /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître; bête/belle : The phoneme in 'maître' and 'bête' is longer than in 'mètre' and 'belle'.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /ẽ/ consonant appendix /ɲ/, and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. The nasal vowel of 'empreinte' is a diphthong, and only the second segment is nasalised /œ̃/. 'Emprunte' is articulated with a clear /œ̃/ nasal phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated identically with an intermediary phoneme that is neither /œ/ nor /œ̃/.

étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ẽ/ and a nasal consonant appendix and 'étang' with the nasal phoneme /œ̃/ and a nasal consonant appendix segment.

M-C BERGERON. 13/11/66 Cadillac.
 Origin of father : Cadillac.
 Origin of mother : Amos.
 Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Secretarial.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ε	ø	
	a	

i	y	u
ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ε:	ø	o
	œ	ɔ
	a	ɑ

ẽ	œ̃	ɔ̃
ẽ	œ̃	ɔ̃
	ã	ɣ

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: No distinction is made between the words of the first pair tested here. Only front /a/ is articulated. However, 'moi' is articulated with a back /a/ phoneme and 'mois' with a front /a/.

peau/pot : Both 'peau' and 'pot' are articulated identically, as /pɔ/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ε/ and the second word of each pair is articulated with a closed /e/.

peu/peux : The /ø/ phoneme of 'peux' is shorter than the /ø/ of 'peu'.

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made between the phonemes.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pom/.

sol/seul : The first word of this pair is articulated as /sɔ/ and the second as /sœl/.

port/part;fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : This phonemic opposition is unstable. 'Feuilles' and 'feutrés' are articulated with the same phoneme /ø/, while /œ/ is articulated in 'jeune' and /ø/ in 'jeûne'.

mètre/mâître;bête/belle : Long /ε:/ is articulated in all words.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : The words of these pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with a /ɛ/ phoneme and an appendix /y/ and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. The nasal phoneme /ɛ̃/ is articulated in 'empreinte' and /œ̃/ is articulated in 'emprunte'.

encadre/ un cadre : 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ã/ nasal and a nasal consonant appendix while 'un' is articulated as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'étang' with /ã/. A nasal consonant appendix follows the delivery of both nasals.

GUYLAINE BISSON 17/03/67 Amos.

Origin of father : Amos

Origin of mother : Amos.

Years in Amos : 16. Other towns : -

Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Nursing.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ		
	a	ɑ

i	y	u
ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ:	œ	ɔ
	a	ɑ

ẽ	ẽ	œ	ɔ
ɛẽ			
	ã		

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi : Both the 'a' phonemes of the ^{first} minimal pair are articulated as front /a/, and 'moi' and 'mois' are articulated differently.
peau/pot : These two words are pronounced identically with a closed /o/ phoneme.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré : Distinction is made between the vowel phonemes of all three minimal pairs tested in this position. A closing variant is articulated for both the phonemes in opposition. /e/ ~ /ɛ/.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, as [pø].

armé/armée : The /e/ of 'armée' is articulated in exactly the same way as the final vowel phoneme of 'armé'.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte; mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'patte' and 'mal', and a back /ɑ/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as [pɔm] and 'paume' as [pom].

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés : An open /œ/ phoneme articulated in the first words of each pair distinguish them from 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' which are articulated with a closed /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître; bête/belle : The phoneme in 'maître' and 'bête' considerably longer than in the second word of each pair.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /ɛ̃/ consonant appendix [ɲ̃], and 'brun' as [brõ]. The nasal vowel of 'empreinte' is a diphthong, and only the second segment is nasalised /ɛ̃/. 'Emprunte' is articulated with a pure /œ̃/ nasal phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; the nasal /ɑ̃/ in 'encadre' and /œ̃/ in 'un'.

étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ɛ̃/ and 'étang' with a /ɑ̃/ phoneme.

GILLES BOUTIN

17/06/66

Amos.

Origin of father : Amos

Origin of mother : Amos.

Years in Amos : 16. Other towns : -

Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Electrician.

i	y	u
e		
ε	ø	o
	a	a

i / I	y / Y	u / U
ε		o
ε.	ø	ɔ
	a	a

ɛ̃	œ̃	õ̃
ã	ãɣ	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi : The opposition between the phonemes in final position in the above words is unstable. The words of the first pair are articulated identically with a front /a/ phoneme. 'Mois' is also articulated with /a/, but 'moi' is pronounced as /mwa/.

peau/pot : These two words are pronounced identically, as /pɔ/.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré : Distinction is made between the vowel phonemes of all three minimal pairs tested in this position. Open /ε/ is articulated in the first words of each pair and a closing variant of /e/ is articulated in the second word of each pair.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, as /pø/.

armé/armée : The /e/ of 'armé' is articulated in exactly the same way as the final vowel phoneme of 'armée'.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte; mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'patte' and 'mal', and a back /ɑ/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pom/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

port/part; fort/phare : The vowel phonemes in these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés : No distinction is made between the words of these pairs; the vowel phoneme being closed /ø/ in every instance.

mètre/maître; bête/belle : The phoneme in 'maître' is the same as in 'mètre', while the 'e' of 'bête' is slightly longer than in 'belle'.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /œ̃/ and a consonant appendix /ɲ/, and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. The nasal vowel of 'empreinte' is a diphthong, and only the second segment is nasalised /ɛ̃/. 'Emprunte' is articulated with a clear /œ̃/ nasal phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; 'en' as /ɑ̃/, and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ɛ̃/ and a nasal consonant appendix, and 'étang' with the nasal phoneme /ɑ̃/ and a nasal consonant appendix.

CHANTAL COGETTE. 15/12/66 Amos.
 Origin of father : Quebec.
 Origin of mother : Quebec.
 Years in Amos : 6. Other towns : Joutel (0-10).
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : University.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ		(ɔ)
	a	

i / I	y / Y	u / V
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ:	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ɛ̃y ε̃ē	œ̃	ɔ̃
ɑ̃y	ɑ̃	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi: Both of the above pairs of words are articulated identically with a front /a/.

peau/pot: 'Peau' is articulated as /po/, while 'pot' is articulated as /pɔt/ as in English.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré: A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ɛ/ and the vowel phoneme in the second word is closing /e/ which tends towards /i/.

peu/peux: There is no variation in the articulation of the vowel phonemes in these words.

armé/armée: No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte; mal/mâle: This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mak' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume: These two words are articulated differently: 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul: /ɔ/ is articulated in 'sol' and /œ/ in 'seul'.

port/part; fort/phare: A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés: The words of each pair are differentiated as the informant articulates a closed /ø/ in 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' and an open /œ/ phoneme in 'jeune' and 'feuilles'.

mètre/maître; bête/belle: 'Belle' and 'bête' are articulated as /bɛl/. 'Mètre' and 'maître' are articulated with the lengthened variant /ɛ:/. Therefore, no distinction is made between the words of each pair.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte: This opposition is stable. 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃y/ and 'brun' as /brɛ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a diphthong /ɛ̃ē/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃/ phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre: 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ɑ̃/ nasal and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang: A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'étang' with /ɑ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

NANCY DELCAMBRE 29/07/67 Cadillac.
 Origin of father : Québec.
 Origin of mother : Québec.
 Years in Amos : 0. Other towns : Cadillac/16
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Medicine.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ		
	a	

i I	y Y	u U
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ:	œ	ɔ
	a	ɑ

ē ē̃	œ̃	ō̃
	ā̃	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: Only front /a/ is articulated in these words.

peau/pot : These two words are pronounced identically, as /poʔ/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : Distinction is made between the vowel phonemes of all three minimal pairs tested in this position. Open /ɛ/ is articulated in the first words of each pair and a closing variant of /e/ is articulated in the second word of each pair.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, as /pøʔ/.

armé/armée : The /e/ of 'armé' is articulated in exactly the same way as the final vowel phoneme of 'armée'.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'patte' and 'mal', and a back /ɑ/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pom/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

port/part;fort/phare : The vowel phonemes in these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : No distinction is made between the words of these pairs; the vowel phoneme being closed /ø/ in every instance.

mètre/maître;bête/belle : The phoneme in 'maître' is the same as in 'mètre', while the 'e' of 'bête' is slightly longer than in 'belle'.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /ɛ̃/ and consonant appendix /ʃ/, and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with an open nasal /ɛ̃/, and 'emprunte' with the nasal phoneme /œ̃/.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; 'en' as /ɑ̃/, and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ɛ̃/ and 'étang' with the nasal phoneme /œ̃/.

MARIE DESBIENS 09/07/66 La Sarre.
 Origin of father : Lac St. Jean.
 Origin of mother : Villebois.
 Years in Amos : 0. Other towns : Villebois/16
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Hairdressing.

i	y	u
ẹ e̥ ȩ	ø	o
ɛ		(ɐ)
a		

i ɪ	y ʏ	u ʊ
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ:	œ	ɔ
a	a	

ẽ̃ ẽ	œ̃	õ̃
ã̃	ã	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: Only front /a/ is articulated in these words.

peau/pot : 'Peau' is articulated with a closed /o/ phoneme while 'pot' is articulated with the English variant /pʊ/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : Distinction is made between the vowel phonemes of all three minimal pairs tested in this position. Open /ɛ/ is articulated in the first words of each pair and 2 variants are articulated for closed 'e', /e/ and /ẽ/.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, as /pø/.

armé/armée : The /e/ of 'armée' is longer than the 'e' in 'armé'.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'patte' and 'mal', and a back /ɑ/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

port/part;fort/phare : The vowel phonemes in these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : 'Jeune' and 'feuilles' are articulated with open /œ/ phonemes as opposed to 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' which are articulated with a /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître;mêle/belle : The phonemes in enclosed position in 'maître' and 'bêle' are clearly longer than in 'mètre' and 'belle'.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /ẽ̃/ and consonant appendix /ɲ/, and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with an open nasal /ɛ̃/, and 'emprunte' with the nasal phoneme /œ̃/.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; 'en' as /ɑ̃/, and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ẽ̃/ and 'étang' with the nasal phoneme /œ̃/. Both phonemes are followed by a nasal consonant appendix.

JOSÉE DOMINGUE 30/03/67 Amos.
 Origin of father : Beauce.
 Origin of mother : Montréal.
 Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Science.

i	y	u
$\frac{e}{\tilde{e}}$		o
ɛ	ø	(ɔ)
	a	

$\frac{i}{\text{I}}$	$\frac{y}{\text{Y}}$	$\frac{u}{\text{U}}$
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ:	œ	ɔ
	a	a

$\frac{\tilde{e}}{\text{e}}$	$\frac{\tilde{o}}{\text{o}}$	$\frac{\tilde{ɔ}}{\text{ɔ}}$
aɲ		

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: Only front /a/ is articulated in these words.

peau/pot : 'Peau' is articulated with a closed /o/ phoneme while 'pot' is articulated with the English variant /ɒ/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : Distinction is made between the vowel phonemes of all three minimal pairs tested in this position. Open /ɛ/ is articulated in the first words of each pair and 2 variants are articulated for closed 'e', /e/ and /e:/.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, with a closed /ø/.

armé/armée : These two words are articulated identically with an unlengthened /e/.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front/a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

port/part;fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : 'Jeune' and 'feuilles' are articulated with open /œ/ phonemes while 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' are articulated with a /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître;bête/belle : This opposition is unstable. The informant states that she pronounces 'mètre' and 'maître' identically. In some instances she does, with the phonemes as long /ɛ:/ . At other times 'mètre' is articulated with a lengthened /ɛ:/ and 'maître' with a short /ɛ/. 'Belle' is articulated as /beɪ/ and 'bête' as /beɪ/.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /ɛ̃/ and consonant appendix /ɲ/, and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with the diphthong /ɛ̃ɛ̃/ , and 'emprunte' with the nasal phoneme /œ̃/.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; 'en' with a back nasal /ɑ̃/ and a nasal consonant appendix and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ɛ̃/ and 'étang' with the nasal phoneme /œ̃/. Both phonemes are followed by a nasal consonant appendix.

HANON DUHAIME. 15/12/66 Landrienne.
 Origin of father : Landrienne.
 Origin of mother : Magog.
 Years in Amos : 16. Other towns : Landrienne.
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Music.

i	y	u
e		o
ɛ	ø	(ɔ)
	a	

i / I	y / Y	u / U
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ:	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ẽy ɛẽ	œ̃	ɔ̃
ã	ãy	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: Both of the above pairs of words are articulated identically with a front /a/.

peau/pot : 'Peau' is articulated with a closed /o/ while 'pot' is articulated with the English phoneme /ɒ/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : Open /ɛ/ is articulated in the first word of each pair, thus differentiating them from the second word of each pair which is articulated with a closed /e/ phoneme.

peu/peux : There is no variation in the articulation of the vowel phonemes in these words. Only closed /ø/ is articulated.

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /ɑ/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : /ɔ/ is articulated in 'sol' and /œ/ in 'seul'.

port/part;fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : The phonemic opposition tested in this position is stable. /œ/ is articulated in the first word of each pair and /ø/ in 'jeune' and 'feutrés'.

mètre/maître;bêlé/belle : 'mètre' and 'maître' are articulated identically with long /ɛ:/, while 'belle' and 'béle' are distinguished. 'Bêlé' is articulated with the longer variant /ɛ:/.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : The words of the first minimal pair are distinguished ; /brẽy/ ~ /brœ/. 'Empreinte' is articulated in the same manner as 'emprunte' with a diphthongized nasal /ɛẽ/.

encadre/ un cadre : 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ɑ/ nasal and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'etang' with /œ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

JOSEE FONTAINE 01/02/67 AMOS.
 Origin of father : Québec.
 Origin of mother : Québec.
 Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Science.

i	y	u
ẽ e		
ε	ø	o
	a	

ɪ I	ʏ γ	ʊ v
ε	ø	o
ε:	œ	ɔ
	ɑ	a

ẽ ẽɣ	œ	ɔ
ẽ	ã	ãɣ

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: These words are articulated identically with a back /a/ phoneme.

peau/pot : 'No distinction is made between the vowel phonemes of this minimal pair. Only closed /o/ is articulated.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ε/ and the second word is articulated with a closed /e/.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, with a closed /ø/.

armé/armée : The 'e' of 'armé' is shorter than the 'e' of 'armée'.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front/a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'male' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

port/part;fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /ɑ/. This phonemic opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : 'Jeune' and 'feuilles' are articulated with open /œ/ phonemes while 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' are articulated with a /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître;bête/belle : This opposition is unstable. 'mètre' and 'maître' are pronounced identically with lengthened /ε:/ phonemes. However, 'belle' is articulated with open /e/ distinguishing it from 'bête' which is articulated with a lengthened /ε:/.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with 2 variants /ẽɣ/ and /ẽy/, and 'brun' as /brœ/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a closed nasal /ẽ/, and 'emprunte' with the nasal phoneme /œ/.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; 'en' with a back nasal /ã/ and 'un' as /œ/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated as /etẽɣ/ and 'etang' as /etãɣ/.

LYNE GAULIN. 30/06/67 Vasson.
 Origin of father : Vasson
 Origin of mother : Vasson.
 Years in Amos : 1. Other towns : Lebel-sur-Quevillon.
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Computer.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ		
	a	

i	y	u
ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ̃	œ	ɔ
ɛ̃	a	a

ɛ̃j	œ̃	ɔ̃
ã	ãj	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: These words are articulated identically with a front /a/ phoneme.

peau/pot : No distinction is made between the vowel phonemes of this minimal pair. Only closed /o/ is articulated.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ɛ/ and the second word is articulated with a closing variant /ɛ̃/.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, with a closed /ø/.

armé/armée : These two words are articulated identically with a short variant /e/.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front/a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm̃/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

port/part;fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/. This phonemic opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : 'Jeune' and 'feuilles' are articulated with open /œ/ phonemes while 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' are articulated with a /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître;bête/beille : This opposition is unstable. 'Mètre' and 'maître' are pronounced identically with semi-long /ɛ̃/ phonemes. However, 'belle' is articulated with open /ɛ/ distinguishing it from 'bête' which is articulated with a lengthened /ɛ̃:/.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃j/, and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a nasal phoneme /ɛ̃/, and 'emprunte' with the nasal phoneme /œ̃/.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; 'en' with a back nasal /ɑ̃/ and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated as /etɛ̃j/ and 'etang' as /etãj/.

ELIANE GERVAIS 05/03/67 Vasson.
 Origin of father : Vasson.
 Origin of mother : Vasson.
 Years in Amos : 1. Other towns : Lebel-sur-Quevillon.
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Computer.

i	y	u
\tilde{e} \tilde{e}	ø	o
ɛ		
	a	a

i I	y Y	u U
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ:	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ēy	ē	œ	ɔ
	ā	āy	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi: A distinction is made between a front /a/ phoneme in 'bas' and 'mois' and back /a/ in 'bat' and 'moi'.
 peau/pot : Both words are articulated with a closed /o/ phoneme.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ɛ/ and the second word is articulated with either /e/ or a more closed variant.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, with a closed /ø/.

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte; mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front/a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : The words in this minimal pair are clearly distinguished.

port/part; fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés : 'Jeune' and 'feuilles' are articulated with open /œ/ phonemes while 'jeune' and 'feutrés' are articulated with a /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître; bête/belle : This opposition is unstable. 'Mètre' and 'maître' are pronounced identically with /ɛ:/ phonemes. 'Belle' is articulated with open /ɛ/ while the 'e' phoneme in 'bête' is lengthened.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte : This opposition is stable. 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃y/ and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a closed nasal /ɛ̃/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃/ phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; 'en' with a back nasal /ɑ̃/ and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'étain' is articulated as /etɛ̃/ and 'étang' as /etɑ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both cases.

MARTIN LACOMBE 21/05/65 Montreal.

Origin of father : Montréal.

Origin of mother : Québec.

Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : Lebel-sur-Quevillon.

Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Photography.

ɪ	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ		
ɛ	a	a

ɪ	y	u
ɛ	œ	ɔ
ɛ:		
	a	a

ɛ̃	œ̃	ɔ̃
ã	ã	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi : This opposition is unstable. The informant articulate 'bas' and 'bat' identically with a back / / phoneme, while 'mois' is articulated with a front /a/ and 'moi' with a back /o/.

peau/pot : Both words are articulated with a closed /o/ phoneme.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ɛ/ and the second word is articulated with a closing /ɛ/.

peu/peux : These words are pronounced identically, with a closed /ø/.

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte; mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : The first word of this pair is articulated with an open /ɔ/ phoneme and the second with the phoneme /œ/.

port/part; fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /œ/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés : Although the informant states that he does not pronounce 'jeune' and 'jeûne' identically, he does. Similarly, 'feuilles' and 'feutrés' are articulated in the same way with /ø/.

mètre/maître; belle/belle : This opposition is unstable. 'Mètre' and 'maître' are pronounced identically with /ɛɛ/ phonemes. 'Belle' is articulated with open /ɛ/ while 'the' 'e' phoneme in 'bele' is lengthened.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte : This opposition is stable. 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃/ and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a diphthong /ɛ̃/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃/ phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : These are articulated differently; 'en' with a back nasal /ɑ̃/ and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'etang' with /ɑ̃/. a nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

ANNIE LANOIX 23/01/66 Amos.
 Origin of father : Amos.
 Origin of mother : Val d'Or.
 Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Nursing.

i	y	u
e̥ e	ø	o
ɛ		
	a	

i	y	u
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ̥	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ɛ̃y ɛ̃	œ̃	ɔ̃
ã	ãy	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi : No distinction is made between the words of the pairs tested here. Only front /a/ is articulated.

peau/pot : Both 'peau' and 'pot' are articulated identically, as /pɔ/.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ɛ/ and the second word is articulated with either closed /e/ or the variant /ɛ̃/.

peu/peux : No distinction of length is made between the phonemes in these words. Both are articulated as /pø/.

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte; mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâl' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pom/.

sol/seul : The first word of this pair is articulated as /sɔl/ and the second as /sœl/.

port/part; fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés : A distinction is made between the words of each minimal pair tested here. The first word of each pair is articulated with the phoneme /œ/, and the second word with a /ø/ phoneme, or a shorter variant /ø̃/.

mètre/maître; bête/belle : The phonemes in 'maître' and 'bête' are clearly longer than in 'mètre' and 'belle'.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte : This opposition is stable. 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃j/ and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a diphthong /ɛ̃/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃/ phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : These are markedly different ; 'en' with a back nasal /ɑ̃/ and 'un' as /œ̃/. There is a glottal stop between 'un' and 'cadre' which exaggerates the distinction.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'etang' with /ɑ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

NATHALIE LAROCHE. 28/07/67 Québec.
 Origin of father : Québec.
 Origin of mother : Québec.
 Years in Amos : 16. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Science.

i	y	u
<u>e</u> e	ø	o
ε		
	a	a

i I	y Y	u U
ε:	ø	o
	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ē ē	œ̃	ɔ̃
ã	ãɣ	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: No distinction is made between the words of the first pair tested here. Only front /a/ is articulated. However, 'mois' is articulated as /mwa/ and 'moi' as /mwa/.

peau/pot : Both 'peau' and 'pot' are articulated identically, as /pɔ/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ε/ and the second word is articulated with the phoneme /e/. However, the /e/ in 'pre' is more closed ; /e/.

peu/peux : No distinction of length is made between the phonemes in these words. Both are articulated as /pø/.

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pom/.

sol/seul : The first word of this pair is articulated as /sɔl/ and the second as /sœl/.

port/part;fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : This phonemic opposition is unstable in the speech of this informant. Whereas 'jeune' is articulated with open /œ/ and 'jeûne' with a closed /ø/ phoneme, 'feuilles' and 'feutrés' are pronounced identically with a closed /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/mâitre;bête/belle : Only a long /ε:/ is articulated here.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : This opposition is stable. 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃/ and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a diphthong /Ẽ/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃/ phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ɑ̃/ nasal and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated with a /ē/ phoneme and 'etang' with /œ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

CHRISTINE L'ECUYER. 10/11/66 Amos.

Origin of father : Rouyn.

Origin of mother : Rouyn.

Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -

Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : University.

i	y	u
e	∅	o
ε		
	a	

i/I	y/Y	u/V
ε	∅	o
	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ēj	œ̃	œ̃	ɔ̃
	ã	ãj	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: No distinction is made between the words of the pairs tested here. Only front /a/ is articulated.

peau/pot : Both 'peau' and 'pot' are articulated identically, as [pɔ̃].

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /E/ and the second word is articulated with a closing /e/.

peu/peux : No distinction of length is made between the phonemes in these words. Both are articulated as [pø̃].

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'male' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as [pɔ̃m] and 'paume' as [pɔ̃m̃].

sol/seul : The first word of this pair is articulated as [sɔ̃l] and the second as [sœ̃l].

port/part;fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ̃/ and front /ã/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : A distinction is made between the words of each minimal pair tested here. The first word of each pair is articulated with the phoneme /œ̃/, and the second word with a /ø̃/ phoneme.

mètre/maître;bête/belle : The words of each pair are articulated identically with an unlengthened /E/.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : This opposition is stable. 'Brin' is articulated as [brɛ̃j] and 'brun' as [brœ̃]. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a diphthong /ɛ̃ẽ/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃ẽ/ phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : These are clearly different. 'En' is articulated as /ã/ and 'un' as /œ̃ẽ/.

étain/étang : 'Etain' is articulated as [etɛ̃j] and 'étang' as [etã̃j].

RICHARD LEFEBVRE. 21/02/67 Magog.
 Origin of father : Montréal.
 Origin of mother : Montréal.
 Years in Amos : 16. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Undecided.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ		ɔ
ɛ	ø	(ɔ)
a		

i	y	u
ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ɛ	ø	o
ɛ:	œ	ɔ
a		a

ēy ɛē	œ	ɔ̃
ã	ãy	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: Although the informant states that he articulates 'bas' and 'bat' identically, this is not the case. The stability of this opposition is confirmed in the test text where 'moi' is articulated with a back /ɑ/ and 'mois' with a front /a/ phoneme.

peau/pot : 'Peau' is articulated with a closed /o/ phoneme, while the vowel phoneme of 'pot' is the English variant /ɒ/ and is followed by /t̪/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ɛ/ and the second word is articulated with the phoneme /e/. However, the /e/ in 'pré' is more closed ; /e̞/.

peu/peux : No distinction of length is made between the phonemes in these words. Both are articulated as /pø/.

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /ɑ/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm̃/.

sol/seul : The first word of this pair is articulated as /sɔl/ and the second as /sœl/.

port/part;fort/phare : No distinction is made here. Both words are articulated as /fɔr/.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : This phonemic opposition is stable. 'Jeune' and 'feuilles' are articulated with an open /œ/ phoneme and 'jeûne' and 'feutrés' are articulated with a closed /ø/.

mètre/maître;bêlé/belle : The /ɛ:/ of 'bêlé' is longer than the /ɛ/ of 'belle'. 'Mètre' and 'maître' are articulated identically.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : In final open position, this opposition is stable; /brɛ̃/ ~ /brœ̃/. No difference is made between the vowel phonemes in final enclosed position: both are articulated as /ɛ̃/.

encadre/ un cadre : 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ɑ̃/ nasal and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Étain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'étang' with /ɑ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

LISE RODRIQUE. 15/12/66 Amos.
 Origin of father : Quebec.
 Origin of mother : Amos.
 Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Typist.

i	y	u
e		
ε	ø	o
	a	

i	y	u
ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ε:	ø	o
	a	ɑ

ẽ	œ	õ
ẽj	œj	õj
ã	ãj	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi: No distinction is made between the words of the first pair tested here. Only front /a/ is articulated.

peau/pot : Both 'peau' and 'pot' are articulated identically, as /pɔ/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ε/ and the vowel phoneme in the second word is sometimes articulated as /e/, sometimes as a more closed /e/.

peu/peux : No distinction of length is made between the phonemes in these words. Both are articulated as /pø/.

armé/armée : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /ɑ/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as /pom/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : The first word of this pair is articulated as /sɔl/ and the second as /sœl/.

port/part;fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /ɑ/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : No distinction is made between the words of these minimal pairs. Only closed /ø/ is articulated.

mètre/maître;pêcle/belle : Only a long /ε:/ is articulated here.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : This opposition is stable. 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃j/ and 'brun' as /brœ̃j/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with an open nasal /ɛ̃/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃/ phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ɑ̃/ nasal and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Étain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'étang' with /ɑ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

MARIO ROUILLIER. 08/12/66 La Sarre.
 Origin of father : La Sarre.
 Origin of mother : Amos.
 Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Electrician.

i	y	u
ɛ	ø	o
		(ɔ)
	a	a

i / I	y / Y	u / U
ɛ :	ø	o
		ɔ
	a	a

ẽj	ẽẽ	œ	õ
ã	ãj		

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi : No distinction is made between the words of the first pair tested here. 'mois' and 'moi' are articulated differently as /mwa/ and /mwa/ respectively.

peau/pot : 'Peau' is articulated as /po/ while 'pot' is articulated with the English variant /p/ and a final /t/.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré : No distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. All vowel phonemes in final open position are articulated as open /ɛ/.

peu/peux : No distinction of length is made between the phonemes in these words. Both are articulated as /pø/.

arme/armee : No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte; mal/mâle : This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /ɑ/ phoneme.

pomme/paume : These two words are articulated differently ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : The first word of this pair is articulated as /sɔl/ and the second as /sœl/.

port/part; fort/phare : A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /ɑ/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés : No distinction is made between the words of these minimal pairs. Closed /ø/ is articulated in every word.

mètre/maître; belle/belle : Only a long /ɛ:/ is articulated here.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte : 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃j/ and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a diphthong /ɛẽ/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃/ phoneme, however, this opposition is unstable as the words are sometimes articulated identically.

encadre/ un cadre : 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ɑ̃/ nasal and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang : A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'étang' with /ɑ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

CHRISTINE SIMARD. 17/05/67 Amos.
 Origin of father : Amos.
 Origin of mother : Québec.
 Years in Amos : 16. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Nursing.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ	ø	
	a	a

i	y	u
ɪ	ʏ	ʊ
ɛ:	ø	o
	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ẽ	ẽ	ẽ	ẽ
ẽ	ẽ	ẽ	ẽ
ã		ã	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi: One out of the two times that 'moi' is articulated, it is with a back /a/ phoneme; the other time with a front /a/. 'Bas' and 'bat' are articulated identically as /ba/.

peau/pot: Both 'peau' and 'pot' are articulated identically, as /pɔ/.

aimait/aimé; fait/rée; prêt/pré: A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ɛ/ and the vowel phoneme in the second word is closed /e/.

peu/peux: No distinction of length is made between the phonemes in these words. Both are articulated as /pø/.

armé/armée: No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte; mal/mâle: This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mâle' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume: A clear distinction is made between the /ɔ/ of 'pomme' and the /o/ of 'paume'.

sol/seul: The first word of this pair is articulated as /sɔl/ and the second as /sœl/.

port/part; Fort/phare: The words of the minimal pairs tested here are clearly distinguished.

jeune/jéune; feuilles/feutrés: Open /œ/ is articulated in the first word of each pair and closed /ø/ in 'jeune' and 'feutrés'.

mètre/maître; bête/belle: Only a long /ɛ:/ is articulated here.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte: This opposition is stable. The vowel phoneme articulated in 'brin' is an open /œ/ nasal followed by a nasal consonant appendix /ɲ/. 'Brun' is articulated as /brœ/. 'Empreinte' and 'emprunte' are articulated identically with a diphthongized nasal /eɹ̃/.

encadre/un cadre: 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ɑ/ nasal and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang: A distinction is made between these two words. 'Étain' is articulated with a /ẽ/ phoneme and 'étang' as /etã/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

CELINE TREMBLAY 06/02/67 Amos.
 Origin of father : La Pocatière.
 Origin of mother : La Sarre.
 Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Human Science.

i	y	u
$\frac{e}{\text{e}}$	$\frac{\emptyset}{\emptyset}$	o
ε	$\frac{\emptyset}{\emptyset}$	
	a	

$\frac{i}{I}$	$\frac{y}{Y}$	$\frac{u}{U}$
$\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$	$\frac{\emptyset}{\emptyset}$	o
$\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$	$\frac{\emptyset}{\emptyset}$	o
	a	a

$\frac{\tilde{e}}{\varepsilon\tilde{e}}$	$\frac{\tilde{o}}{\tilde{o}}$	$\frac{\tilde{u}}{\tilde{u}}$
\tilde{a}		

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi : no distinction is made between back /a/ and front /a/ in the words of the above minimal pairs. Only front /a/ is articulated.

peau/pot : These words are articulated identically.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré : A definite difference can be detected in the informant's pronunciation of the minimal pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with an open /ε/ phoneme, and a variant of closed /e/ is articulated in the second word. The variant /e/ is more closing and tends towards /i/. /e/ is also articulated in some instances.

peu/peux : 'Peux' is articulated with a closed /ø/ phoneme that is marginally shorter than the /ø/ phoneme of 'peu'.

armé/armée : There is no detectable difference in the length of the final vowel phonemes of the above two words.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte; mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'pattə' and 'mal', and a back /a/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as [pɔm] and 'paume' as [pɔm].

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is maintained.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés : This opposition is unstable. The words in the first minimal pair are distinguished, but both words of the second pair are articulated with a closed /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître; bête/belle : 'Belle' is articulated as [bɛl] while 'bête' is articulated with the longer variant [ɛː]. However, both words of the first pair are articulated with the longer variant [ɛː].

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte : The words of both these minimal pairs are clearly distinguished. 'Brin' is articulated with the nasal /ẽ/ consonant appendix /ɥ/, and 'brun' as [brœ̃]. The nasal vowel of 'empreinte' is diphthongized so that it is articulated as [ɛẽ] and 'emprunte' is articulated with a clear /œ̃/ nasal phoneme.

encadre/ un cadre : The nasal vowel phoneme of 'un' is the same as above, 'un' /œ̃/ and 'encadre' is articulated with a back nasalised /ɑ̃/.

étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ẽ/ and a nasal consonant appendix and 'étang' with the nasal phoneme /ɑ̃/.

HANON TREPANIER. 15/12/66 AMOS.
 Origin of father : Québec.
 Origin of mother : Québec.
 Years in Amos : 17. Other towns : -
 Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Health.

i	y	u
e		
ɛ	ø	o
	a	

i / I	y / Y	u / U
ɛ / ɛ̃	ø	o
ɛ̃	œ	ɔ
	a	a

ɛ̃ / ɛ̃̃	œ̃	ɔ̃
ã	ã̃	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat; mois/moi: Both of the above pairs of words are articulated identically with a front /a/.

peau/pot: 'Peau' and 'pot' are articulated identically, with /o/.

aimait/aimé; fait/fée; prêt/pré: A clear distinction is made between the words of the above pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with open /ɛ/ and the vowel phoneme in the second word is closed /e/.

peu/peux: There is no variation in the articulation of the vowel phonemes in these words.

armé/armée: No distinction in length is made here.

Final enclosed position.

patte/pâte; mal/mâle: This opposition is stable. The articulation of front /a/ in 'patte' and 'mal' distinguishes these words from 'pâte' and 'mak' which are articulated with a back /a/ phoneme.

pomme/paume: These two words are articulated differently; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pom/.

sol/seul: /ɔ/ is articulated in 'sol' and /œ/ in 'seul'.

port/part; fort/phare: A clear distinction is made between open /ɔ/ and front /a/. The opposition is very stable.

jeune/jeûne; feuilles/feutrés: In the first interview, the informant differentiates 'jeune': /ʒœn/ and 'jeune': /ʒœn/. However, in the taped extract both 'feuilles' and 'feutrés' are articulated with a closed /ø/ making this phonemic opposition unstable.

mètre/maître; belle/belle: This opposition of length is also unstable in the speech of this informant. 'Belle' is articulated as /bɛl/ and 'bele' as /bɛ:l/. 'Maître' is articulated as /mɛtr/ while 'mètre' is articulated with only a slightly longer variant /ɛ̃/.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun; empreinte/emprunte: This opposition is stable. 'Brin' is articulated as /brɛ̃/ and 'brun' as /brœ̃/. 'Empreinte' is articulated with a diphthong /ɛ̃̃/ and 'emprunte' with an /œ̃/ phoneme.

encadre/un cadre: 'Encadre' is articulated with a back /ɑ̃/ nasal and 'un' as /œ̃/.

étain/étang: A distinction is made between these two words. 'Etain' is articulated with a /ɛ̃/ phoneme and 'étang' with /œ̃/. A nasal consonant appendix follows in both words.

RENE VACHON

11/05/67

Amos.

Origin of father : Québec.

Origin of mother : Québec.

Years in Amos : 16. Other towns : -

Languages : 0. Studies envisaged : Computer.

i	y	u
e	ø	o
ɛ		(ɔ)
	a	

i I	y Y	u U
	ø	ɔ
ɛ	œ	
	a	a

ɛ̃ ɛ̃	œ̃ œ̃	ɔ̃ ɔ̃
ã	ã̃	

ORAL VOWELS

Final absolute position.

bas/bat;mois/moi : Only front /a/ is articulated here.

peau/pot : These words are articulated differently as the final /t/ of 'pot' is articulated and the vowel phoneme is anglicised; /ɒ/.

aimait/aimé;fait/fée;prêt/pré : A definite difference can be detected in the informant's pronunciation of the minimal pairs. The first word of each pair is articulated with an open /ɛ/ phoneme, and a closed /e/ is articulated in the second word.

peu/peux : 'Peux' is articulated with a closed /ø/, as is 'peu'. armé/armée : There is no detectable difference in the length of the final vowel phonemes of the above two words.

Final enclosed position .

patte/pâte;mal/mâle : A clear distinction is made between the front /a/ phoneme in 'patte' and 'mal', and a back /a/ in 'pâte' and 'mâle'.

pomme/paume : These two words are distinguished clearly ; 'pomme' as /pɔm/ and 'paume' as /pɔm/.

sol/seul : A clear distinction in the pronunciation of these words is made by this informant.

jeune/jeûne;feuilles/feutrés : A distinction is made with the first word in each pair being articulated with an open /œ/ and the second word with a closed /ø/ phoneme.

mètre/maître;bête/belle : No difference in length is made between the vowels in final position in the above words.

NASAL VOWELS

brin/brun;empreinte/emprunte : This opposition is unstable : 'brin' and 'brun' are articulated as /brɛ̃/ and /brœ̃/ respectively, while 'empreinte' and 'emprunte' are articulated identically with a diphthongized nasal /ɛ̃œ̃/.

encadre/ un cadre : The nasal vowel phoneme of 'un' is the same as above, 'un'/œ̃/ and 'encadre' is articulated with a back nasalised /ã/.

étain/étang : This minimal pair is stable. 'étain' is articulated with an /ɛ̃/ and a nasal consonant appendix and 'étang' with the nasal phon-eme /ã̃/, and appendix.

(3) The status of phonological oppositions(a) Final open position

- Oppositions of timbre

/a/ ~ /ɑ/: For the minimal pairs tested in this position, only one informant always articulates the phonemes as front /a/ and back /ɑ/ respectively. The opposition is unstable in the speech of seven informants; sometimes a clear distinction is made and other times only front /a/ is articulated for both words of a minimal pair. Seventeen informants never differentiate the words of each minimal pair. Of this number, two informants articulate the phonemes as back /ɑ/ and fifteen as front /a/.

/ɛ/ ~ /e/: This phonological opposition which occurs only in final open position is stable. Only one informant makes no distinction articulating an open /ɛ/ phoneme for all the words tested. However, although all the other informants clearly differentiate the contrasting phonemes, the point of articulation is varied. Five informants make a distinction between an open /ɛ/ and a closed /e/. Eight make a distinction between an open /ɛ/ in words such as 'fait/prêt/aimait' and a variant of closed /e/ in 'fée/pré/aimé'. The variant form is a more closed phoneme which tends towards /i/. It is represented by the symbol /e̞/. This phoneme is in fact articulated by a total of eighteen informants. Of this number, eight as stated above always articulate /e̞/ in contrast to open /ɛ/. A further eight informants articulate either /e/ or /e̞/ in contrast to open /ɛ/. In these cases, where /e/ and /e̞/ are interchanged, /e/ is articulated only in the imperfect verb ending '-ait', and /e̞/ is retained in the nouns 'fée' and 'pré'.

Finally, three informants deviate from the trends identified above. One informant articulates a diphthongized variant of a closed /e/. It is followed by a /j/ phoneme so that it becomes /e^j/. Variants of open /ɛ/ are made by two informants. One of these articulates a closing /ɛ̃/ but as the closed /e/ contrasting phoneme is also a closing variant /ẽ/, the opposition remains stable. The other informant sometimes articulates open /ɛ/ and sometimes a lengthened variant /ɛ:/.

/o/ ~ /o/: Of the twenty-five informants, fifteen do not differentiate between 'peau' and 'pot'. Both words are articulated with a closed /o/ phoneme. One informant articulates a distinction of length; the /ō/ of 'pot' is slightly shorter than the /o/ of 'peau'. Nine informants clearly differentiate the two words. 'Peau' is articulated by these subjects as /po/. For 'pot', a final /t/ consonant is articulated which has the effect of opening the preceding vowel which is realized as /ɔ̃/ as in English 'pot'.

- Oppositions of length

/ø/: Nineteen informants articulated a closed /ø/ for both 'peu' and 'peux'. The other six informants made a distinction of length articulating the /ø̃/ phoneme of 'peux' as a slightly shorter phoneme.

/e/: No informants made any distinction of length in the final phonemes of 'armé' and 'armée'.

(b) Final enclosed position

- Oppositions of timbre

/a/ ~ /ɑ/: All informants clearly distinguish between a back /ɑ/ and a front /a/.

/o/ ~ /ɔ/: Twenty-four of the twenty-five informants articulate these phonemes in stable opposition. One of this

number tends to slightly close open /ɔ/ but the distinction between /o/ and /ɔ/ remains clear. Only one informant makes no distinction at all articulating an open /ɔ/ in every instance.

/ɔ/ ~ /œ/: Clear distinctions are made by all informants for this opposition.

/ø/ ~ /œ/: Seventeen informants clearly distinguish closed /ø/ and open /œ/. Four informants sometimes articulate these phonemes identically and at other times, differently, thus for them it is an unstable opposition. Four informants do not make any distinction at all; three of these articulating closed /ø/, and one articulating open /œ/.

/ɔ/ ~ /ɑ/: All of the twenty-five informants clearly distinguish the vowel phonemes in the minimal pairs tested for this phonemic opposition.

- Oppositions of length

/ɛ/: Seven of the twenty-five informants make absolutely no distinction between the vowel phonemes in final enclosed position of the minimal pairs. Five of this seven always articulate a long /ɛ:/. In fact, any open /ɛ/ articulated in this position such as 'tête' is articulated as a lengthened /ɛ:/ by these informants. Two of the seven informants making no distinction articulate an unlengthened /ɛ/ in all the words tested. For four informants this phonemic opposition is stable as they always articulate clear distinctions between /ɛ/ and the longer variant /ɛ:/. Eleven informants always make distinctions between the words in the minimal pairs section, but articulate the words in the test text identically. For this group, the opposition is unstable.

Of the remaining three informants, two articulate three different phonemes in random distribution. The phonemes are

/ɛ/, a slightly lengthened variant /ɛ˙/ and long /ɛ:/.

One informant makes a distinction of length between /ɛ/ and the slightly lengthened variant /ɛ˙/

(c) Nasal vowels

/œ/ ~ /ɛ̃/: The words of the first minimal pair testing the phonological contrast /œ/ ~ /ɛ̃/ are clearly distinguished. Two variant phonemes are articulated in 'brin', /ɛ̃/ and /œ̃/. Without exception, a nasal consonant is given in appendix. Of the twenty-five informants, twenty articulate an open /ɛ̃/ and five, a closed /œ̃/. 'Brun' is articulated by all informants as /brœ̃/.

In the second minimal pair testing this opposition, a distinction is always made by twenty informants. The remaining five informants articulate the two words identically. Where this is the case the phonemes in enclosed position in both words are articulated with an open /ɛ/ followed by a nasalised closed /œ̃/. This diphthong /ɛ̃̄/ is also articulated in 'emprunte' by eighteen of the twenty-five informants.

/ã/ ~ /œ̃/: This is a stable opposition. Only two of the twenty-five informants articulate the two words identically. One of these articulates the nasal /ã/ for both words and the other informant articulates an intermediary phoneme between /ã/ and /œ̃/. The twenty-three informants who make a distinction articulate /ã/ in 'encadre' and /œ̃/ in 'un cadre'.

/ɛ̃/ ~ /ã/: All informants clearly distinguish these words. Twenty informants tag a nasal consonant appendix on the /ã/ of 'étang'. 'Etain' is also articulated with an open /ɛ̃/ nasal and a nasal consonant appendix. Only three of the informants who articulated 'brin' with a nasal consonant appendix do not here.

(4) Patterns of variation in the speech of twenty-five Amos informants

The pattern of responses discussed in the preceding section has isolated some interesting features of the phonological habits of the subjects whose speech was analysed in this survey.

In final open position the phonemic contrast between back /ɑ/ and front /a/ is disappearing in favour of front /a/. The fact that no distinction is made between these phonemes by seventeen informants, and only occasionally by seven informants indicates that a merger of /ɑ/ and /a/ is in process. The status of /ɛ/ and /e/ is different.

This phonological opposition is very stable. The analysis revealed that the majority of informants articulate a more closing variant of /e/ in words ending in '-é'. Whether this phoneme /ɛ/ is characteristic of Amos only, or Québec speech in general is uncertain.

As for distinctions of length between phonemes in final open position, these are rarely made for the vowel phonemes of 'peu' and 'peux', and never for 'armé' and 'armée'. This does not seem to affect communication as the words tested would be differentiated contextually.

The articulation of vowel phonemes in one minimal pair may however result in communicative problems between speakers who articulate variant forms. The minimal pair is 'pot' - 'peau' which was only tested as a precautionary measure. For certain informants there was a tendency to articulate the final 't' of 'pot' as in the south of France (le Midi).⁵ The vowel phoneme was articulated as the English vowel /ɒ/. The phonological relevance of this tendency will be discussed

subsequently.

The oppositions of timbre in final enclosed position are perfectly maintained with the exception of a few informants who do not distinguish /ø/ and /œ/. The most important factor which emerged in this analysis was that all twenty-five informants clearly distinguish /ɔ/ and /ɑ/. Although no studies of a specifically phonological nature have confirmed that this merger is rife in Montréal, phonetic analyses have shown that /ɔ/ and /ɑ/ are often confused. Future studies may well corroborate that this is regional characteristic.

The distinctions of length tested in final enclosed position are fairly stable. Only a few informants do not articulate differences. Whether this merger is regressing or progressing could only be established by comparison with its status several years ago (no studies exist on this question), or the findings of future surveys.

The examination of the nasal phonemes in the speech of Amos informants yielded the most interesting results as these could be compared to the findings of Léon's study of Québec French nasals.

The minimal pairs and reading text tests revealed that the three phonemic contrasts tested are stable in the speech of most informants.

The first opposition /œ/ ~ /ɛ/ was perfectly maintained in final open position. In final enclosed position it was maintained by the majority. A number of variations particularly a diphthongized nasal were articulated.

The distinction between /ɑ̃/ and /œ̃/ was clearly articulated, as was the distinction between /ɑ̃/ and /ɛ̃/.

Phonologically, the articulation of nasal phonemes by

Amos informants is *effective*. Characteristic features of the articulation of nasal vowels are the nasal consonant appendix which invariably follows / \tilde{e} / in final open position and frequently follows / \tilde{a} /, and the diphthongized variant / $\epsilon\tilde{e}$ / found in enclosed syllables ending in a consonant.

Although the present investigation was primarily concerned with identifying the phonemes of the speech of informants, comparison with the findings of previous studies necessarily bears on the question of linguistic change.

Léon's test revealed that there was a 50% error of interpretation for the opposition / \tilde{a} / ~ / \tilde{e} / . This was due to the fact that / \tilde{a} / was often articulated more towards the front as / $\tilde{\text{æ}}$ / . He predicted that the standardization process in the evolution of Québec French would return to normal and that particular nasal phonemes would be affected:⁶

"Si des facteurs sociologiques de prestige tendent à effacer, par exemple, les diphtongues, d'un côté, les pressions du système interviennent dans 2 cas très nets. Dans le premier cas, comme en FS, le mauvais rendement de l'opposition / \tilde{e} / ~ / $\tilde{\text{æ}}$ / va tendre à supprimer / $\tilde{\text{æ}}$ / . Dans le second cas, / $\tilde{\text{æ}}$ / va tendre vers la réalisation [\tilde{a}] pour éviter vraisemblablement la confusion de [\tilde{e}], réalisation de / \tilde{e} / et [\tilde{e}] réalisation de / $\tilde{\text{æ}}$ / ." 7

The findings of the present study show that / \tilde{a} / and / \tilde{e} / are clearly distinguished and there is no tendency to articulate / \tilde{a} / more towards the front as / $\tilde{\text{æ}}$ / .

However, the phonemic contrast / $\tilde{\text{æ}}$ / ~ / \tilde{e} / did not show any signs of a merger. It is possible that this may not occur as there is a greater need to maintain a distinction in Québec French than there is in standard French. In the latter variety there is only one minimal pair for this opposition in final open position. However, Québec French lexical borrowings from English have resulted in a greater number, therefore

necessitating that the distinction be maintained. The borrowed word is 'fun' which contrasts with both 'fin' and 'faim'.⁸

One of the aims of this survey was to identify any particularities of the phonological articulation of Amos informants. It has been seen that these were the tendency to articulate /e/ in words such as 'pré', the variant /ɔ/ in 'pot', clear distinction of /ɔ/ ~ /a/, /œ/ ~ /ē/ and /ɑ/ ~ /ē/, diphthongization of /ε̃/ and extensive articulation of nasal appendices. Some of these characteristics such as the variant /e/ are of phonetic rather than strictly phonological relevance, except in rare cases where the contrasting phoneme /ε/ is also articulated as a closing variant /ɛ̃/. Others are contrasted to standard French such as /œ/ ~ /ē/, and Québec French such as /ɔ/ ~ /a/ and /ɑ/ ~ /ē/.

Phonemic oppositions which are not uniformly articulated by all informants deserve particular attention. The discussion so far has isolated these oppositions and has in an elementary way shown that the disappearance of distinction in the length of /ε/ and /ε:/ may be due to the age of informants, while the maintenance of the distinction /ɔ/ ~ /a/ may be a regional feature, and the differentiation of /œ/ and /ē/ may be attributed to the requirements of communication.

Although it is outside the limits of this study to examine sociolinguistic correlates of phonemic variables, the aim did encompass their identification. One further objective was to determine whether the phonological systems of informants contributed in any way to negative value judgements that they may have about their language. It has been seen that the vowel phonemes of Amos informants would rarely cause communicative problems. One contrast however has been isolated for further examination.

(5) A case study: 'pot/peau'

The articulation of /pɔ̃/ and a final /t/ in 'pot' by several informants was the most interesting finding of the phonological analysis. It has been isolated for further discussion for two reasons: (1) an attempt will be made to determine the phonological relevance of the deviation, and to establish possible reasons for it; (2) the case-study will show, how after the essential study of idiolects, non-uniform linguistic variables can be identified and isolated for further analysis of the correlation with non-linguistic variables.

There are four possible reasons why 'pot' was articulated as /pɔ̃t/:

(1) A lexical discrepancy: Speakers of Canadian French may not be familiar with the standard French expression 'avoir du pot'.

(2) Québec French speakers with English background: English parentage or competence in the English language may affect the pronunciation of this word.

(3) The variable of age: The informant's are all of a generation where the American English usage of 'pot' to mean drugs may be a form they have adopted.

(4) Contextual confusion: This is related to (3) above. If the informants do use 'pot' in both the standard French way to mean 'luck' and the English way to mean 'drugs', then it is possible that the context led them to believe that 'pot' in the English sense should be articulated. The context in which the word was found in the test text was " ... il était mal dans sa peau. Bref, il n'avait pas de pot". Both variant meanings could be used without the sentence becoming non-sensical.

The first of the four outlined possibilities for the deviant pronunciation is unlikely as only some of the informants articulated the variant /ɒ/. The second is also irrelevant as an examination of the informants' backgrounds showed that they do not have any English parentage, nor do they speak English. A combination of both (3) and (4) above is the most likely explanation.

If this explanation is valid, it can be inferred that the articulation of /ɒ/ in 'pot' was an isolated case. Therefore, under normal circumstances where context would make it clear, it would not be phonologically pertinent. Nevertheless, this case-study is based largely of speculation. Only further study with a larger number of subjects would establish whether /ɒ/ would be articulated in 'pot' in a different context; or by speakers of different ages.

NOTES

1. Cf. Chapter II. 2
2. The phonological opposition /ɔ/ ~ /ɑ/ was identified while I was listening to a conversation between a standard French speaker and a Quebec French speaker (from Montreal). The French speaker believed the latter was saying 'phare' where in fact he was saying 'fort'. The nasals /ã/ ~ /œ/ and /ẽ/ ~ /ǣ/ were included as a precautionary measure. Charbonneau in Etudes sur les voyelles nasales du français canadien showed that these oppositions can cause semantic confusion because the system of Québec French is displaced in relation to standard French.
3. Henriette Walter, Enquête phonologiques et variétés régionales du français, Presses Universitaires de France, 1982.
4. Ibid., p. 96
5. Pierre Léon et. al., Les accents des français, Hachette, 1983.
6. Cf. Chapter II. 2.
7. Pierre Léon, "Les voyelles nasales et leurs réalisations dans les parlers français du Canada", Langue Française, 60, 1983. p. 61.

CONCLUSION

It must be recalled that the aim of this study was to examine phonological data, and to validate or negate personal observations by identifying the attitudes of subjects towards their own speech and towards language in general. This involved employing two very different approaches to linguistic research.

The first of these, the 'phonological approach' was based on the theories of Martinet and Walter, and a questionnaire used widely in contemporary linguistics, particularly for studies of the French language.

The second, the 'sociolinguistic approach' was based on research conducted primarily in North America by Labov in English speaking communities.

The phonological survey discovered characteristics of the phonemic articulation of the twenty five informants. Three oppositions that are unstable in either standard French or Québec French were shown to be stable in the speech of the group under study: /ɔ/~/a/; /ɑ/~/ẽ/; /œ/~/ē/. Moreover, it was shown that the opposition /ẽ/~/œ/ which is stable is reinforced not only by necessity, but also by the addition of a diphthong. A closing variant /ɛ/, and an English phoneme in 'pot' were also shown to be characteristic features. A case study for the latter of these showed possible sociolinguistic correlates of the tendency, and re-emphasized the requisite of the study of idiolects so that such tendencies can be identified and then further examined - a tenet of the phonological approach.

The sociolinguistic survey also showed the necessity of

a preliminary study of idiolects; unfortunately however, it was revealed in an analysis of why the phonetic test did not work. It was seen that one of the items in the phonetic test, selected on the basis that it was typical of Québec French pronunciation, was not at all. This was the characteristic of Canadian French where /ɔ/ is confused with /a/. This was not the case for Amos informants. This isolated downfall, and the sociolinguistic surveys as a whole, showed the necessity of conducting pilot studies in the area where one envisages conducting the real survey.

The findings of the sociolinguistic surveys did still bring out some interesting points, particularly that on both conscious and unconscious levels the informants are 'linguistically secure'.

When compared to the findings of earlier studies of attitudes in Québec; the trends seem to have followed the more recent tendency identified by Georgeault and Léon; that French Canadian subjects are feeling increasingly secure with regard to their language.

The presentation of this work was, in addition, the opportunity to conduct and practise research skills. Overall, it has shown the necessity of pilot studies; the fundamental precaution that one should never assume that what holds for one speaker, social group or area, holds for another; and the importance of distinguishing phonetic and phonological data.

The application of two different methods has led to the conclusion that the linguist should concern himself more with phonological analyses than with attitudinal studies. The former makes an excellent study in isolation to give insight into the structure of language, and it also provides the

concrete base for further study of social, regional or other correlates.

Conversely, although attitudinal study is interesting, it is unwise for the linguist to conduct research which is based largely on the interpretation of sociological and psychological data.

If one does dabble in these disciplines without formal training, then subjectivity tends to creep in and the objective nature of study is lost.

If the value of attitudinal surveys is to tell us something about linguistic behaviour and language change, in this particular case; at least for the French of Amos, the interplay between linguistic economy and necessity appears to be more important than sociolinguistic considerations of prestige.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the supervision of Dr. Ewen Jones. I am extremely grateful to him for his continued interest and valuable help.

I am indebted to Fernand Roy and Daniel Lampron, academic staff of 'polyvalente la Mosaïque' secondary school in Amos for allowing me to conduct research at the school. I am equally indebted to the senior class who were willing and enthusiastic informants.

My appreciation is also due to students at EPSCI in Paris who were informants for the pilot studies, Guillane de Fenoyl and Françoise Cloutier whose voice productions were used in the survey, and Chantal Leclerc, Jean Bernier and Christine Signolles who checked the authenticity of specimen pronunciations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General

- Barbeau, V. Le français au Canada, L'académie canadienne française, Montréal, 1963
- Bergeron, L. The Québécois dictionary, James Lorimer, Toronto, 1982
- Brault, G.J. "Le français en Nouvelle-Angleterre", Le français hors de France, Valdman, A. (ed.), Honoré Champion, Paris, 1979
- Chantefort, P. "Diglossie au Québec, limites et tendances actuelles", Langue française, 31, Larousse, Paris, 1976
- Corbeil, J-C. "Origine historique de la situation linguistique québécoise", Langue française, 31 Larousse, Paris, 1976
- Darbelnet, J. "Le maintien du français face à l'anglais au Québec", Le français hors de France, Valdman, A. (ed.), Honoré Champion, Paris 1979
- Dulong, G. Le dictionnaire correctif du français au Canada, Les presses de l'université Laval, Québec, 1968
- Gagne, G. "Quelques aspects socio-linguistiques du français au Canada et au Québec", Le français hors de France, Valdman, A. (ed.) Honoré Champion, Paris, 1979
- Laurence, J.M. "Phonétique corrective", Grammaire française, Guérin, Montréal, 1976
- Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire design and attitude measurement, Heinemann, London, 1968
- Orkin, M. The sound of Canadian French, General Publication Co. Ltd., Toronto, 1971
- Petyt, K.M. "Who is really doing dialectology?" Linguistic controversies, Crystal, D. (ed.), E. Arnold, 1982
- Turenne, A. Le petit dictionnaire du joual au français, Editions de l'homme, Montréal, 1962

Sociolinguistic

- d'Anglejan, A.
and Tucker, G. "Sociolinguistic correlates of speech style in Québec", Language attitudes: current trends and prospects, Shuy, R.W. and Fasold, R.W. (eds.) Georgetown University Press, Washington, 1973
- Brennan, E.M.
and Brennan, J.S. "Measurements of accent and attitude toward Mexican-American Speech", Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, Vol. 10, No 5 1981
- Georgeault, P. Conscience linguistique des jeunes québécois, Editeur officiel du Québec, 1981
- Giles, H. and
Powesland, P.F. Speech style and social evaluation, Academic Press, London, 1975
- Hudson, R.A. Sociolinguistics, Cambridge University Press, 1980
- Labov, W. The social stratification of English in New York city, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, 1966
- The study of nonstandard English, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, 1969
- "The study of language in its social context" (1970), Sociolinguistics, Pride, J.B. and Holmes, J. Penguin, 1972
- Sociolinguistic patterns, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972
- Lambert, W.E.
Frankel, H. and
Tucker, G. "Judging personality through speech: A French-Canadian example", J. Communication, Vol. 16, 1966
- Lambert, W.E. "A social psychology of bilingualism", (1967), Sociolinguistics, Pride, J.B. and Holmes, J., Penguin, 1972
- Leon, P. "Attitudes et comportements linguistiques, problèmes d'acculturation et d'identité", Etudes de linguistique appliquée, Vol. 15, Didier, Paris, 1974

- Méar-Crine, A. and
Leclerc, T. "Attitudes des adolescents canadiens
français vis-à-vis du franco-qubécois et
du français académique", La sociolinguistique
au Québec, Cahier de linguistique No 6, Les
presses de l'université du Québec, 1974
- Mills, C. "Speech samples in analysis of language
attitudes", Journal of Psycholinguistic
Research, Vol. 10, No 6, 1981
- Trudgill, P. Sociolinguistics, Penguin, England, 1974

Phonetics and phonology

- Charbonneau, R. "Recherche d'une norme phonétique dans la
région de Montréal", Etudes sur le parler
français au Canada, Les presses de
l'université laval, Québec, 1955
- Etudes sur les voyelles nasales du français
canadien, Les presses de l'université Laval,
Québec, 1971
- Debrie-Maury, N.G. "Les archiphonèmes I, U, u dans le français
canadien et dans le parler Normand",
Recherches sur la structure phonique du
français canadien, Léon, P.R. (ed.) Didier,
Paris, 1968
- Deyhime, G. "Enquête sur la phonologie du français
contemporain", La linguistique, I/II, 1967
- Gendron, D. Tendances phonétiques du français parlé au
Canada, Les presses de l'université Laval,
Québec, 1966
- Gueunier, N. Genouvrier, Khomsi, A. Les français devant
la norme, Champion, Paris, 1978
- Léon, P. Les accents des français, Hachette, Paris
1983
- "Les voyelles nasales et leurs réalisations
dans les parlers français du Canada", Langue
française, 60, Larousse, Paris, 1983
- Léon, P. and
Nemni, M. "Franco-canadien et français standard:
problème de perception des oppositions
vocaliques", Recherches sur la structure
phonique du français canadien, Léon, (ed.)
Didier, Paris, 1968

- Martinet, A. La prononciation du français contemporain, témoignages recueillis dans un camp d'officiers prisonniers, Paris, 1945
- Economie des changements phonétiques, Berne, 1955
- La description phonologique, Paris-Geneve, 1956
- "L'analyse phonologique", Eléments de linguistique générale, Paris, 1960
- Eléments de linguistique générale, Paris, 1960
- and Walter, H. Dictionnaire de la prononciation française dans son usage réel, France-Expansion, Paris, 1973
- Martinet, A. "Ce que n'est pas la phonologie", Langue française, 60, Larousse, Paris, 1983
- Reichstein, R. "Etudes des variations sociales et géographiques des faits linguistiques", Word, 16, 1960
- Schogt, H.G. "Une case vide: la phonologie diachronique du français canadien", Recherches sur la structure phonique du français canadien, Léon, P.R. (ed.), Didier, Paris, 1968
- Seguinot, A. "Etude sur le degré de nasalité des voyelles nasales en français canadien et en français standard", Recherches sur la structure phonique du français canadien, Léon, P.R. (ed.), Didier, Paris, 1968
- Walter, H. and Martinet, A. Dictionnaire de la prononciation française dans son usage réel, France-Expansion, Paris, 1973
- Walter, H. La phonologie du français, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1977
- Enquête phonologique et variétés régionales du français, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1982
- Phonologie des usages du français, Langue française, 60, Larousse, Paris, 1983